





THE LAND QUESTION IN NORTH WALES



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

Ec. H
V 7724 Kx

THE LAND QUESTION IN NORTH WALES

BEING

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE HISTORY, ORIGIN, AND
CHARACTER OF THE AGRARIAN AGITATION

AND OF

THE NATURE AND EFFECT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE WELSH LAND COMMISSION

J. E. Vincent BY
J. E. VINCENT
BARRISTER-AT-LAW

SECOND EDITION

515387
15. 12. 50

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

1897



*Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & CO.
At the Ballantyne Press*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

History of Welsh Land Question—Distinction of Welsh Case from Irish and Scotch Cases—Attempt to confuse Land Question with Church Question—Influence and Operations of Welsh Vernacular Press—Lord Penrhyn's Evidence from Welsh Press—"Adfyfr's" "Landlordism in Wales"—Mr. T. E. Ellis, M.P., and Lord Penrhyn . . . Pp. 1-40

CHAPTER II.

Formation of North Wales Property Defence Association—its object—not hostile to Farmers—it asks for a Commission in April 1892—Mr. T. E. Ellis's Speech of May 1892—His Indictment—Mr. Gladstone's Observations upon it—Mr. Chaplin's Criticism—Mr. Gladstone's Snowdon Speech—His Statistics—the Inaccuracy of Inferences drawn from them—the Irrelevance of any Inference from them . . . Pp. 41-54

CHAPTER III.

*The Commission appointed—its Constitution—Antecedents of Members—Majority of Radicals over Unionists—the Terms of Reference and their Meaning—Issue affects English and Scotch Land also—Summary of Complaint against the Commission, its Methods and its Procedure
Pp. 55-61*

CHAPTER IV.

Procedure and Practice of the Commission—their Refusal to admit Counsel—Lord Penrhyn's Offer—Rules as to preliminary Copies of Evidence—"Members of the Public" permitted to exhibit Questions in Writing—Secretary to communicate with Persons aggrieved—Opportunities of Rebuttal to be given—Examples of Breach of these Rules—and of their ineffective Character when kept—Stringency of Procedure as to Rebuttal—the Allegation of Fear among the Tenantry—Mr. David Jones and Lord Penrhyn and the Conduct of the Secretary of the Commission—the strange Case of Parker at Newtown—the reckless Reception of irregular Evidence—prohibition of elementary Tests of Evidence—the Commissioners "revelled in Hearsay"—the Allegation of "fear" among Peasantry—its Manufacture—wild Interpretation of Terms of Reference—an Omnibus Commission Pp. 62-89

CHAPTER V.

Majority of the Commission started with Prejudice in Favour of a Land Court—Assertion justified by Selection of Questions—Treatment of Witnesses opposed to a Land Court—severe Cross-examination—Mr. Brynmor Jones, Q.C., M.P., and Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West—Lord Carrington and Captain Stewart—the "Coffin letter" rejected by Lord Carrington—the Sequel in the Merionethshire Outrage—Lord Carrington and the Clergyman—Mr. Brynmor Jones insults some Montgomeryshire Farmers—the Commission fails to secure Evidence from Substantial and Representative Farmers Pp. 90-111

CHAPTER VI.

Report of the Majority of the Commission predicted—will recommend something equivalent to a Land Court—North Wales Landowners state their Position—Definition of Essentials of a Land Court—the Irish Land Courts—Report of the Committee on the Irish Act of 1881—the Duke of Argyll's Exposure of the Act—Mr. Gladstone's "Original Righteousness" and subsequent Collapse—Theories of "Fair Rent" examined—Effects of Judicial Rent must be destruction of Friendly Feeling, to turn Landowner

into mere Rent-charger, to check Improvement by Mutual Agreement, the Establishment of Saleable Tenantright, the Giving of part of Owner's Property to the sitting Tenant—the Evils of Free Sale—Irish examples—condemned by Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P., and Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P.—Further Effects of a Land Court are Reduction in Selling Price of Land—Impossibility of State Advances to Peasant Proprietors who are encumbered—Compensation alone necessary Pp. 112–139

CHAPTER VII.

The Agrarian Indictment—its Allegations (1) Exorbitant Rents and Inadequate Recognition of Depression, (2) Insecurity of Tenure, (3) Sectarian Preference in Choice of Tenants, (4) Rent raised on Tenant's Improvements, (5) over-stringent Agreements, (6) Game Damage, &c., (7) wrongful Enclosure of Commons, (8) Stoppage of Sale of "Goodwill"—some Evidence as to the said "Goodwill."

Evidence as to Raising of Rents—its Vagueness—the Errors made in such Evidence—the Incapacity of the Witnesses—as to borrowing Money to pay Rent—Leading Questions in Commission's Syllabus—Treatment of Witnesses who alleged Landowners to be considerate—Mr. Richard Jones and the Socratic Method—how Farms are valued—Standard lower in Wales than in England—Danger of going by Abatements and Reductions simply—an Important Appendix Pp. 140–154

CHAPTER VIII.

Alleged Insecurity of Tenure—Microscopic Evidence of Capricious Eviction—1858 and 1868 too long ago—Accusations of Cunvassing against Landowners and Agents—not proved, but why should they refrain?—The True Answer found in Tables of Hereditary Tenancy—Evidence in Detail from many Estates Pp. 155–177

CHAPTER IX.

*Sectarian Preference—Evidence of Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P.—a ridiculous Letter—an unauthorised Circular which was not circulated—Absence of Evidence—95 p.c. of tenantry Nonconformists.
Contracts out of Agricultural Holdings Act 1883—not proven—void if made—*

Contracts out of Custom of Country defended—Copies of Agreements easily to be obtained—Grievances as to "Services" quite unreal—Grievances as to Game, minor—Penal Clauses in Agreements Pp. 178-191

CHAPTER X.

Game Grievances—a silly Story—the Preferential Claim—Arguments for and against—Abolition involves a "Forehand Rent"—Enclosures of Commons and Crown Wastes—purely Legal Questions on which Landowners declined to give Evidence—the Case of Squatters—the Evidence of Mr. Salt—Concerning the Raising of Rent—no Evidence taken of Development of Country and Markets—Vagueness of Idea of Tenant's Moral Rights in the Way of Compensation—Lord Carrington's former estate in Cardigan-shire—Weakness of Allegations that no Compensation had been paid—Important Evidence of Expenditure in Improvements on many estates—full Statistics Pp. 192-229

CHAPTER XI.

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883, unfair to both Parties to the Contract—substituted Scales of Compensation—the Act a Dead Letter in Glamorgan-shire, where custom is better—the Act killed the Development of less perfect Custom elsewhere—Amendments of the Act, on just Principles, desired.
Rents of small Farms necessarily higher in Proportion than those of large—Case for North Wales Landowners summarised—they have established, before a hostile Commission, the Right to even Treatment with English Landowners—they ask justice Pp. 230-241

APPENDICES.

- I. *Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone* Pp. 243-264
- II. *Figures and Statements as to Abatements, Reductions and History of Rental* Pp. 265-313
- III. *Particulars relating to Chapels' Sites* Pp. 314-320

THE LAND QUESTION IN NORTH WALES.

CHAPTER I.

History of Welsh Land Question—Distinction of Welsh case from Irish and Scotch Cases—Attempt to confuse Land Question with Church Question—Influence and Operations of Welsh Vernacular Press—Lord Penrhyn's Evidence from Welsh Press—"Adfyfr's" "Landlordism in Wales"—Mr. T. E. Ellis, M.P., and Lord Penrhyn.

No treatise upon the subject into which the Welsh Land Commission was requested to inquire would be complete or even intelligible without something in the way of a connected account of the manner in which the Welsh Land Question, *if question it be*, came into being and of the progress of the history of the Question. And first be it observed that the history to be told in this case is not, as it would be if it were necessary to deal with the like subject in relation to Ireland, or to the crofting areas of Scotland, distinguished by great length nor, for the consideration of the matter from a practical point of view, is it essential to indulge the passion for antiquarian research. It is true that the Welsh Commission did from time to time digress into those antiquarian paths; and no doubt they will report the results of their inquiries; it is also true that from each digression something in the nature of profitable information was reaped; but the harvest went, in

an unthreshed condition and in the form of wheat sheaves with a large admixture of tares, to the general storehouse of knowledge. For practical purposes it was of no value save from a negative point of view ; it was of no use save to show in rather a vague way that the case of Wales is entirely distinct from that of Ireland or of thecrofting areas of Scotland. This is a matter of some importance, because it is clear from the fact that three revolutionary Acts, contradicting and nullifying one another in some measure, have been passed in connection with Irish Land Tenure within the last thirty-five years, and that the Crofters Acts have also been in active operation for some little time, that there is a large body of British citizens, more or less adequately represented in Parliament, who think that special circumstances may justify legislation contrary to economic principle, reactionary in tendency and confiscatory in spirit. For our part we venture to hold the contrary opinion and to believe that, great as are the present evils which have arisen from the Irish Land Acts, they are not to be compared with those which must inevitably follow from attempts to tinker at and improve a system which is bound to produce increasing evils, since it is an attempt to defy those laws governing human action which are, as sound economists know, essentially laws of nature. But it is idle to pretend to ignore the existence of persons, some of them earnest men and thoughtful, who hold in complete sincerity an absolutely different theory. Prudence and generalship, therefore, dictate that, without surrendering for a moment the impregnable fortress of principle, we should meet our opponents first on their own ground.

Is there any similarity between the peaceful story of the advance of civilisation in Wales and the troubled history of Ireland? A glance at the annals of that unfortunate island makes the answer to that question apparent at once. Almost from the beginning of authentic history up to the

time of William III., the tide of battle, of conflict with invaders and of domestic warfare, of conquest and reconquest, ebbed and flowed over her fertile soil. Time after time she was half devastated and half depopulated; time after time groups of invading Englishmen were planted upon her, the native owners being dispossessed to that end. So late as 1774 we find Arthur Young writing: *

“The lineal descendants of the old families are now to be found all over the kingdom working as cottiers on the lands that were once their own . . . it is a fact that the descendants of the old landowners regularly transmit by testamentary deed the memorial of their right to those estates which once belonged to their families.”

A fatal policy of thwarting Irish manufactures in the interest of English manufactures tended to throw an inordinate portion of the population upon the land. Old customs, such as tanistry and gavelkind, died exceedingly hard. New customs, such as the Ulster tenant-right, were imported. The tribal idea survived long by the side of English law, which was imposed by force only. In short, the development of civilisation was slow in Ireland. Each successive Parliament found her people backward, discontented, prone to acts of violence, a century at least behind their fellow subjects. Such, in brief outline, are the factors, or some of them, which have gone to make the Irish problem as a whole; and such also are the facts which have induced English statesmen to try the application of empirical remedies to a social disease which has baffled their best efforts. It is worthy of note, by the way, that the Welsh Land Commission, while it declined to accept evidence from the counsel of the North Wales Property Defence Association with regard

* “Landholding and the Relation of Landlord and Tenant,” *Field*.
Calcutta: Thacker & Spink. 1883.

to the operation of the Irish Land Acts, and was eventually satisfied to do without any such evidence, did accept evidence on the operation of the Crofters Acts from Mr. Donald Macrae, the best-known of crofter advocates and from Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff and others.

In the case of the crofting areas history tells a slightly different tale. That the Highlands also came comparatively late under the influence of civilisation is true enough. But the main causes which brought about the Crofters Acts, we will not say justified them, were the following. Firstly, *teste* Lord Napier's Commission, the tribal idea survived, with some reality of living force, to a late period and, well into this century, the people had a hazy idea, based not upon any fanciful theory of political equity, but upon local tradition that they had a right to the land. Secondly, the tack system, by which large tracts of land were leased to the relations and hangers-on of the proprietors, to be sublet in their turn to minor tenants, was not, according to modern views, conducive to sound estate management. The proprietor, divorced from personal interest in the land, had certainly no inducement to invest capital in it; the tacksmen could not improve the land because for the most part they had little or no money, and further, if they had possessed the means, would have had little inducement to expend them in the improvement of the soil. Still, as the Duke of Argyll showed plainly in the eloquent and convincing evidence which he gave before the Welsh Land Commission, it was never fair to assume that the whole of the building work done was effected by the crofter tenants. What does seem tolerably clear is that the system of extensive sheep-runs introduced, probably with much agricultural wisdom at the time, did tend to the detriment of the crofter tenants, who were, at the best of times, miserably poor; and did tend to kindle a vague sense of grievance in their minds. The story of forcible transplantations of crofter populations, a story which has been used over

and over again to stir up sentiment, has doubtless some foundation in fact, but His Grace's evidence shows clearly that it has been greatly exaggerated.

Reverting for a moment to the case of Ireland, it may be added that absenteeism, albeit the stories concerning it must be taken *cum grano*, was an early fault of the English landowners who replaced the native owners, and that it is matter of common belief that the capital invested by them in the great industry of agriculture had but a very small proportion to that invested by the tenants. On that belief, no doubt, Parliament acted to some extent in passing the series of Irish Land Acts. Recent investigations, made when the steed had been stolen, so to speak, have shown clearly that the number of exceptions to the rule was very large, and that the confiscation of the fruits of landowners' investments has been more considerable than was intended by Parliament. In fact, the Irish landowners as a body did not marshal their solid army of facts and figures until it was too late. On the other hand, the vast mass of impregnable statistics which Welsh landowners have placed before the Commission shows that the fate of the Irish landowners has given them a timely warning which has not been neglected.

Be the reasons what they may, it is an undeniable fact that whereas the Irish Land Question has been a burning question from time immemorial, the alleged Welsh Land Question is a plant of quite recent growth. Twenty years ago, nay, fifteen years ago, it was unheard of. Nor were the causes far to seek. Since the conquest of Wales no part of the United Kingdom has suffered less from the ravages of war than the Principality. In no part of the kingdom has there been less impediment to the steady march of civilisation. The tribal idea died very early. The native owners, as the rolls of sheriffs for various counties prove by the endless series of Cymric names, were never dispossessed. Colonel Cornwallis West drew the attention of the Commission at Ruthin to the great

preponderance of Welsh names among the owners of property in the various counties of Wales enumerated in the return of 1873; and he might have supplemented his argument by showing that in almost all the cases where a large estate is held by an owner bearing a Saxon or Scottish name the result has been brought about by the marriage of Englishman or Scot to a Welsh heiress. Industry has never been thwarted. On the contrary, it has been encouraged by the great landowners. Lord Penrhyn and Mr. Assheton Smith do but follow the traditions of their predecessors in employing armies of men at the famous quarries. Sir Watkin Williams Wynn and other great landowners have spared no effort to develop the mineral resources of Denbighshire, Flintshire, and Montgomeryshire, and it is their misfortune, not their fault, that the lead-mining industry has fallen into decay. In South Wales the whole prosperity of Cardiff is due to the enterprise of the Bute estate in creating the great docks which, aided by the coal behind in the hills, have turned a village into a city of 150,000 inhabitants within the period of the century.

English law has been administered to Welshmen equally with Englishmen from time immemorial. No vestige of the old Welsh laws has been seen, except by virtue of antiquarian research, for many centuries. The law regulating the relation of landlord and tenant has, for all practical purposes, been identical in England and Wales for many centuries. The changes of tenancy in Wales have been far less numerous than in any other part of the kingdom, due regard being taken for the proportion of population. The relation of landowner and tenant was, until the agitation was started a few years ago, uniformly friendly, and is really as friendly as ever in the overwhelming majority of cases now that the Commission has done its work.

It may be asked how it came about that the appearance of a Land Question was brought about in a community having, on the whole, so happy a history as that which the Principality

can boast. The answer is to be found in the weighty words addressed to the Commission by Lord Penrhyn at Llangefni, on the 14th of October, 1893; but before those words are cited it is necessary to make a few observations summarising what is, for the most part, common knowledge, in order that the position may be clear.

It is well known that at the time when the Welsh dioceses were united to the province of Canterbury, through the efforts of him whom ancient Welsh divines were wont to call "the accursed Awstin, the monk," the Ancient British Church and the Church of England became one. Such changes as the Reformation involved were made in England and Wales equally. Simultaneously with the accession of the present dynasty to the throne, and in pursuance, as the writer believes, of a mistaken idea that the Welsh could be absolutely Anglicised, a practice of appointing English-speaking bishops to Welsh sees arose and produced exceeding bad results. In any case (whether through the default of the clergy or not matters little for the present purpose) Nonconformity began to make strong headway at the beginning of the present century, and was not very long before it parted company with the Church. It must be remembered, however, that the early fathers of Welsh Nonconformity, the men who brought about a religious revival and started the Sunday-school system were, almost to a man, ordained clergymen who desired nothing less than rupture from the Establishment. Then gradually Nonconformity became hostile to the Church, the said hostility originating, at any rate, among the ministers of Nonconformity, amongst whom are to be found in this day the most active Radical politicians and journalists in Wales. Their political influence in Wales, especially in the agricultural districts, is not at all inferior to that of the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland; they are the makers of members of Parliament. To men thus circumstanced the passage of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Church Bill opened a new horizon, and

from that day to this they have agitated incessantly for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church in Wales.

Now, though it is by no means true that all Welsh landowners are Churchmen, or that all Welsh tenants are Nonconformists, it is probably true that the larger part of the acreage of Wales is in the hands of Churchmen and that the majority of the tenant-farmers are Nonconformists. Evidence will be quoted in due course to show that the actual cases in which it has been alleged that a tenant has been at any disadvantage in dealing with his landlord by reason of his creed are so very indefinite and so remote in point of time as not to be worth thinking about. But that is not the immediate point.

Between 1880 and 1890 the agitation against the Church was at its height. It took the form, on paper, of the Anti-tithe League; it took the form in practice of organised resistance to the payment of the tithe-rent-charge culminating in riots, some of them of a very serious character, at Mochdre (Flintshire), Meifod (Montgomeryshire), Amlwch and Bodfordd (Anglesey), and spread in an acute form to the counties of Carnarvon, Cardigan, and Merioneth. In fact the Welsh people, who are by nature as quiet and peace-loving a people as any in the world, were, during the decade mentioned, in a state nearer to general lawlessness—for the Rebecca riots were local—than during any other period of the century. Against this spirit of lawlessness a number of individual landowners did undoubtedly set their faces; and it is submitted that it was their duty as men of position so to do, for although Mr. Justice Wills (a Nonconformist judge by the way) did lay it down that a refusal to pay the tithe was a lawful protest, it is beyond question that such lawful protests against the payment of debts, which in their turn were also lawful, ended in violent disturbance and were an obstacle to husbandry. So much must be, to use the word which will seem applicable from some points of view,

admitted; from another point of view it may be said that so much must be protested. But, descending again for the moment to the platform of the adversary, it is necessary to add that there were not wanting occasions on which the clergy, on their part, complained that the landowning classes had not stood by them as firmly as might have been expected. Where one party avers that a class has done too much, and the other party declares that the same class has done too little, the chances are that the class accused has chosen the golden mean, only to find, as is the common rule of human experience, that the sterling character of the gold is not recognised.

Be that as it may it is certain that until the anti-tithe agitation in Wales became acute, nothing whatsoever was heard about a Welsh Land Question; and certain it is also that, if there had been anything to hear, it would have been made manifest in the columns of the vernacular Press. Something no doubt had been said in 1859 when, it is beyond question, there had been evictions for political reasons in Wales as there had been in England. But if the memory of these evictions has not faded away, as Mr. Thomas Ellis asserted firmly in his evidence that it had not, the fact still remains that his assertion dealt merely with a matter of opinion, while there is not a particle of doubt that the Ballot Act and the Corrupt Practices Act have been passed as a matter of fact. Still less doubt is there that the tenantry of Wales, like all other intelligent persons, have always understood that the Act was effectual, and have acted on the knowledge. In fact the whole of the indignation which arose from the evictions of 1859, exaggerated as the accounts of those evictions undoubtedly were, was dead and cold, and defied the efforts of the most ardent resurrectionist. It was only in connection with the fact that the Church and the landowners stood in some measure side by side, that the Land Question, in an acute form, was really raised. It was raised in the

vernacular press in the form of threats, repeated and violent, in which landowners were warned of the fate which they would incur if they persisted in supporting the cause of the Church. Such was the tone used that one must suppose the conductors of the vernacular press to have forgotten a fact which, none the less, they can hardly deny; to wit, that even landowners are citizens of the United Kingdom endowed inalienably with no less freedom of thought and action than Nonconformist ministers, tradesmen, farmers and journalists.

Hence came it that Lord Penrhyn addressed to the Commission the words (Q. 2279 and onwards) to which reference has been made. Speaking as the chairman of a body of landowners practically representing the whole of North Wales, of a body which had resolved in 1886 "that landowners should meet their tenants fairly and liberally in the existing depression of their business," he said:

"I next desire to lay before the Commission, in the most earnest manner and as being vital to the whole question, facts which, in my opinion, prove that the agitation upon the Welsh Land Question was unreal in origin, and had not its source in any genuine sense of grievance on the part of the agricultural community. The said facts consist of articles and letters published in the Welsh vernacular press. From the foundation of this Association, and for some time prior to that date, careful watch has been kept on the publications of the vernacular press and translations of articles and letters affecting the interests of landowners have been made for the Association. The accuracy of such translations can be proved to all reasonable satisfaction and in the vast majority of instances the originals can be produced. The said translations have been submitted to Mr. J. E. Vincent, who is present, and I now tender them to you, believing that they will prove that this agitation was deliberately fomented by journalistic sensational writings, with the object of creating

a feeling in the country which would tend to the advantage of the proprietors of the vernacular press, and to the detriment of the Church and landowners in Wales; for this purpose I rely on extracts which I shall quote briefly. I shall, moreover, be able to show from those extracts that the agitation on the land question for some time was a failure, and that for years past landowners have been abused persistently and without regard to truth in the vernacular press, that obsolete prejudices against England have been resuscitated, and that all manner of threats and contumely have been poured on those tenants who might not be inclined to join in the movement. I hand in the extracts believing that no argument of mine is necessary for explaining their obvious meaning. I hand in also a list of the articles giving the date of each, the paper in which it was published, with a few words indicating the nature of the article. I now, with the permission of the Commission, propose to read some of the extracts referred to."

His lordship then cited an extract from the *Herald Cymraeg* (Carnarvon) of May 26, 1886, notifying the fact that a meeting was to be held at Rhyl in June, with the view to the establishment of "a society similar to the Irish League," and "earnestly requesting all farmers in the Principality to be present." This was the first occasion, it is believed, upon which a public endeavour was made to bribe the Welsh tenant with a promise of the legislation passed undeniably to the pecuniary benefit of the then sitting race of Irish tenants (although to the detriment of all succeeding tenants), since it simply gave them, without consideration paid, a portion of property which formerly belonged to their landlords.

The Rhyl meeting was not promising in advance, and it was found necessary (*Genedl*, June 9, 1886) to invite the

co-operation of the labouring classes, whom the agitators tempted in the following manner :

“ You, labourers and working men, do not keep like Dan in his ships while we are fighting our enemies, but come with us, and you shall get a share of the spoils. . . . *Within less than three hundred years ago all the land belonged to the people*, but by this time it has been usurped by a class of men who call themselves the lords of the land, which is hideous unrighteousness.”

If it be hideous unrighteousness to enunciate a deliberate untruth, such as that contained in the italicised passage, an untruth for which there is not so much as a sand-grain of even apparent foundation, then it is to be feared the editor of this *Genedl*, who circulated this statement amongst the monoglot Welsh, was hideously unrighteous.

The attempt to transplant Irish methods to Wales does not appear to have been followed with immediate success. But the sequel will show that the suggestion was not quite barren of fruit ; witness the recent and cruel outrage in Merionethshire. As early as the 29th September the *Gwyliedydd* had to announce that a meeting was to be held in Liverpool “ for setting up a Welsh national movement on the plan of the Irish.” How this scheme failed, how every scheme failed which emanated from the fertile brain of Mr. Thomas Gee, proprietor of the *Baner* newspaper at Denbigh and “ minister of the Gospel,” shall be narrated in due course in the words of Dr. Pan Jones, himself one of the most fiery agrarian agitators in Wales.

Meanwhile, to the diligent student of the Welsh Press—and it was wise indeed of the North Wales landowners to be such students—the failure at that time of the attempt to create a Land Question where none existed, and to convert a contented body of tenantry into lawless and discontented persons, was

plainly visible. Obviously the agitators had nothing to hope from their original scheme. Although agricultural depression (which, fortunately for Wales, has never been so intense as that of corn-growing England, and has been varied by occasional touches from the "magic wand of prosperity") might have been expected to incline the farmers to listen to the voice of the grievance-monger, they remained quiet, bearing their misfortunes, of which their landlords took a generous share, with such patience as they might.

In this crisis the persons responsible for the conduct of the *Baner* newspaper conceived an idea as iniquitous as malicious.

Now the *Baner* is a weekly journal in the vernacular, much read in Wales. It is the property of Mr. Thomas Gee, of Denbigh, a Calvinistic Methodist minister, who, when he gave evidence before the Commission at Denbigh, betrayed a remarkable desire to evade his proper responsibility for articles which had appeared in his paper, and appeared to be unable to remember numerous extracts which seemed to outsiders to possess a character such as would certainly strike the attention of a newspaper owner.

It was in this paper that the attempt to use religious prejudice as a weapon against landowners was made with a persistent venom which, to those who have the intelligence to perceive and the candour to confess the absolute distinction between the two questions, will carry its own condemnation. The campaign began in November 1886 thus—the translations given being those used by Lord Penrhyn, all of which had been verified carefully. All the originals were handed in to the Commission.*

* Some apology is due to the purely English reader for the style of these translations and for the precise renderings of Welsh idioms which they contain. Having regard, however, to the fact that these translations were all verified carefully for the purpose of being given in evidence before the Commission, it has seemed proper to reproduce them precisely in their original form. Where the result of fidelity has seemed likely to tend to obscurity brief explanations are inserted in brackets and italics.

*From the "Herald Cymraeg," published at Carnarvon,
May 26th, 1886.*

"It is understood that vigorous preparations are being made by the Committee of the Agricultural Society of the counties of Denbigh and Flint with regard to the meeting at Rhyl. It is not finally settled whether it is to be on the 15th or the 22nd of June, but this will be settled soon. Mr. John Roberts, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., and Mr. Thomas Gee, and several of the foremost men in the land movement have signified their readiness to accept the invitation given them to come and take part in the proceedings. The chief object of this meeting is to sketch the means of establishing amongst the farmers of North Wales a society like the Irish League, and to plant branches of it in every county in North Wales. All the farmers in the Principality are earnestly requested to be present, so that a prosperous and thorough beginning may be made of the parent society."

The "Genedl," June 9th, 1886.

"You labourers and working men do not keep like Dan in the ships while we are fighting our enemies, but come with us and you shall get a share of the spoil.

* * * * *

"Within less than three hundred years ago all the land belonged to the people, but by this time it has been usurped by a class of men who call themselves the lords of the land, which is hideous unrighteousness."

* * * * *

The "Gwylidydd," September 29th, 1886.

"Arrangements are being made in Liverpool to hold a meeting for setting up a Welsh National movement on the plan of the Irish one."

In the *Baner* of November 3rd, 1886, there are threats against the landlords if they support the Church ; that is the subject of this quotation :—

“Neither can the landlords, at this time, afford to come between the farmers and the parsons in the present contest. The land question is far from being in a satisfactory condition, and undoubtedly they will have need of every help that is within their reach to settle its satisfactorily. And we would advise them not to forget [*i.e.*, *obliterate*] the relics of good feeling that subsist between many of them and their tenants by this unnecessary intermeddling. Let it be remembered that the first cry which was raised in Ireland was ‘No tithe,’ and then because of the meddlesome and molesting behaviour of the landowners was raised the shout ‘No rent.’ Circumstances in Wales are not greatly to be distinguished from what took place in Ireland, and if the latter shout should be raised in Wales they [*i.e.*, *landowners*] will have no one to blame but themselves.”

The “Baner,” November 24th, 1886.

“The battle of the Welsh nation against landlordism is beginning in earnest. The feeling of fairness and justice which the nation possesses has condemned the operation of the system long since ; but now, need and poverty and misery have begun to put the verdict into operation. The days of soft and sweet words about the landlords are quickly passing away. The farmers, the countrymen, and the villagers of Wales have been praising and showing respect to the landlords with their lips, whilst they knew in their hearts they were thus paying a discontented tribute to the devourers of the marrow of their bones.

* * * * *

“There has been a generation or two of Irish farmers trampled down by landlordism, hundreds of them and their

families have been starved to death, and thousands have left their beloved land for America, with a curse in their hearts for the system that trod them down.

“The Welsh farmers are going through the same sufferings. But the farmers of Ireland awoke, and they have bruised the head of Irish landlordism. They sought, as the Welsh farmers are seeking, for a reduction in their rents by humble petitions to their landlords; but the burden of the landlords’ song is warning the farmers against forming themselves into associations. But united and determined associations won the battle in Ireland. This alone will win in Wales. One of the chief duties of these associations, and friends of the farmers, is to publish the villainous and horrible acts of landlordism, in particular crushing down families to poverty and wretchedness by exorbitant rents. In this manner the Irish reformers worked upon Mr. Gladstone, and on the public conscience of Britain.”

The “Baner,” December 11th, 1886.

“We confess that the unfaithfulness of farmers to each other is a very exceptional thing in Ireland. More the pity, in Wales this is a common evil. In the ‘Emerald Isle,’ the landlord’s oppression and ‘boycotting’ have wonderfully cemented the tenants together; at the same time there are a few examples to the contrary even there, and the Tory papers make a great stir about them as independent and fearless people. Traitors and servile flatterers rather, like their Welsh brothers.”

The “Baner,” December 22nd, 1886.

“The landlords ought particularly to beware of giving the slightest support to this measure.

“Because if they do, if—to use the words of ‘John Jones,

Bryniau Iâl,' in one of his talented letters in the *Baner*—they insist upon making themselves shields to the clergy, let them be informed that the fate of shields will be their lot. The country is determined to insist upon having the tithe from the parsons for the sake of having it to lighten their own burdens."

The "Baner," December 18th, 1886.

"The object of this, of course, will be to give timely notice to owners of land that it is at their peril they agree to the trick of the Ministry in letting themselves to be made shields between their tenants and the parsons, for the question that will arise then will be 'No rent' as well as 'No tithe.'"

The violence of the foregoing passages is unmistakable; the menace addressed to landowners is in no way disguised. What Mr. Gee allowed to be printed in his paper was, in effect, this: If you who are landowners dare to support the Establishment we, as newspaper proprietors, will encourage the farmers to inaugurate a system of boycotting and a conspiracy not to pay rent.

Attention, also, may be called to such expressions as "devourers of the marrow of their bones," "villainous and horrible acts of landlordism." It may be noted that the extract of December 11th, 1886, also points clearly to the fact that the farmers refused to hear the voice of the charmer.

In 1887 there was a slight variation in the policy and a change of tune was tried. An Anti-tithe League was already in existence; an attempt was made to change it into a Land League, or rather to merge the two Leagues in one; and inasmuch as neither League ever had any substantial existence except on paper the task was simple. For the rest the extracts of 1887, which are appended, are noticeable chiefly

for violence of tone and for a *naïf* confession, in the form of correspondence obviously solicited by the editor, if indeed it was not concocted in the newspaper office, that the circulation of the *Baner* was not all that its proprietor's heart could desire. It is also entertaining to observe, from the extract of December 21st, that the same old League or Leagues, under a new name, could collect for the support of agitation during 1887, 1888, and 1889 no more than the sum of £82 13s. 2d. in all, of which £10 came from the pocket of Mr. Gee, and £10 from an unhappy Radical parliamentary candidate.

The "Baner," July 13th, 1887.

"This week we will only suggest the two following changes:—1. That the scope of the League be enlarged. Now only the tithe is taken into account. But could not many other important questions connected with the land be included, and that, too, without relinquishing anything as to the tithe? We believe it can be done. If so, would it not be prudent henceforth to use this name and call it the Land League instead of the above?"

The "Baner," August 13th, 1887.

"Notes:—Of one thing we are quite certain. If the Church and Tory landlords were to leave their tenants alone, they would make short and unceremonious work of the tithe. The landlords are fools enough to shield the clergy. The effect of this will be to change, or rather to extend, the battlefield."

The "Baner," August 31st, 1887.

"They ought to have them for half their present rents. 'He that denies this, let him deny that the sun rises.' Also

there is need for more unity amongst us as farmers. We ought to stand out for a general reduction in our farms. And if any 'Judas' happens to come to sight, he ought to be chased out of the country."

The "Baner," September 10th, 1887.

"It is not right for us to publish as much as is known regarding the intention of establishing the above League in Wales, and we had not thought of making known the intention at all, till the Anti-tithe Society at its yearly meeting had declared its opinion that it was advisable for it to extend its sphere, and take under its notice other questions besides the tithe, and take, besides that, a more appropriate name for its new position.

* * * * *

"After full and careful consideration, the following were unanimously agreed upon :—

"I. That it would be wise to change the name of the Association, and henceforth call it 'The Welsh National League.'

"II. That the operations of the Association should be extended so as to take in the following :—(a) the tithe; (b) the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Wales; (c) all the important questions connected with the land.

* * * * *

"Allow us to state that the movement would have taken place some months ago, except that the leaders of the movement in the Vale of Clwyd were desirous of seeing if some other towns were not ready to take the responsibility. It was expected that Carnarvon or Aberystwyth or some other large town would have taken the lead, and the Liberals of these districts would have given every possible support and assistance to the League, wherever it made its home. But since

there appeared no such sign it was determined to undertake the work in these districts, since it is high time to begin operations.

"We will now leave the question by saying this: If the above proposals are approved of, the association will appear in a new guise, and will be much stronger, and will be known by the name of 'The Welsh National League.' We believe it will receive the warm support of the nation everywhere."

The "Baner," October 12th, 1887.

"In a report of the Aberystwyth Liberal Conference, Dr. Pan Jones,* of Mostyn, in proposing a resolution (which was passed unanimously) that reform of the Welsh Land Laws was necessary, said that no reform would be sufficient unless it put a stop for ever to the oppressive power now exercised by the landowners. The landowners claimed all things in heaven and earth. The landlord system was insufferable in the extreme, as it made the tenant bow down before a trinity of robbers—the landowners, the agents, and the clergy. The blackest spot on the history of the country was the conduct of the landowners."

The "Baner," October 26th, 1887.

"Allow a word to be said by one who would like to see all your fetters shattered, and to see you in the possession of all your rights. I am afraid that many of you are quite content to remain in deep ignorance of the important questions which bear the closest relation to your comforts and your prosperity. In other words, I am afraid that many of you do not see or read the newspapers which advocate your rights. I do not say this at a venture, but from knowledge. There are three

* Dr. Pan Jones is a Congregational minister localised at Mostyn, in Flintshire. He is also the editor and proprietor of the *Celt*, in which the theories of land nationalisation are advocated in strong language.

national newspapers in the Welsh language which serve you with praiseworthy fidelity, namely, the *Baner*, *Herald*, and *Genedl*; and several Nonconformist newspapers, as the *Goleuad*, *Tyst a'r Dydd*, do the same. And yet—which is almost incomprehensible to me—I know many of you into whose houses not as much as one of these faithful servants is received one day in a year. You complain of your burdens and sigh for release from them, but yet ignore those who are doing their best for your deliverance. Is that kind of you? Is it fair? Their price is not in the way, because the highest of them is only twopence a week—the price of a half pint or half an ounce of tobacco. Believe me, it is you who lose by it. It would not be so much in my sight to see the circulation of the newspapers of the Principality increasing, as it would to see you as a class increasing in knowledge of the great questions now before the country, and which are so closely connected with your future. You will see what my object in this letter is. I admit that I cannot reach the eye nor the ear of the careless by it; but I trust to be able to increase the zeal of those under whose notice this will come, to move others to follow their examples, because it is indispensable that there should not be one farmhouse throughout the whole of Wales into which one newspaper or other is not received and read.—I am, &c.

“HORACE.”

[The above letter was reprinted in the *Baner* for October 29th, 1887.]

The “Baner,” November 2nd, 1887.

“*Re ‘Horace’ and Welsh Farmers.*”

“Will the letter of the above correspondent in your last number have a good effect upon Welsh farmers? Indeed, it ought to have. It had a wonderful effect on me. I felt when I read it that it was the request of a man whose heart was

bleeding on account of the distressed state of the agricultural classes, and who wished them (the farmers) to know that, and to recognise the labours of those who labour on their behalf, and exert themselves to remove the burdens which oppress them, and make them (the farmers) acquainted with the points discussed for them by societies and individuals. They can do this by reading the accounts of meetings which are published in our newspapers every week, as well as the strong articles published in their columns week after week. Six Welsh newspapers were named by 'Horace,' which the Welsh farmers would do themselves a service by reading. Remember, friends, that the day of your deliverance is not far off, but before that perhaps some of you will be called upon to state your opinion on the position of things and the way in which you would like to see them settled, as was lately the case in connection with the tithe inquiry. And such fools you would make of yourselves if you did not know the A B C of what you grumbled about. If you took 'Horace's' advice and purchased one of the newspapers mentioned you would be enlightened on many subjects which are dark to you now.

"YSBRYD LLEWELYN."

The "Baner," November 2nd, 1887.

(This extract is one of the gems of Welsh journalism.)

"Some of the Welsh landowners are about the best men who ever wore shoes. They are kind and affectionate, and have shown their sympathy with their poor tenants in a substantial way. But it is surprising how few of these there are. It is almost as difficult to get hold of a white rook in Wales, or a white elephant in Bengal, as it is to find a kind landlord. It is necessary for a man to walk scores of miles over hills and vales, through the wilderness and the forests, past many a village and hamlet, before he will see the cheerful face of one of these characters. A kind landlord! He is a lamb amongst

wolves, a Liberal amongst Tories, a John Howard amongst slaveholders, a kind John amongst bums and scamps. A kind landlord! Let every child lisp his name, every maid sing his praises, every philanthropist declare his praise, and every bard make a crown of roses for him. The common idea of a landlord is a man who has the mouth of a hog, the teeth of a lion, the nails of a bear, the hoofs of an ass, the sting of a serpent, and the greed of the grave. The sailor knows well about the *sharks* of the sea, and the farmers know well the *sharks* of the land. The landowners of our country are, in general, cruel, unreasonable, unfeeling, and un pitying men. It does not matter to them who gets drowned so long as they are allowed to be in the lifeboat; it does not matter to them who suffer the mortal pangs of poverty and hunger, if they have plenty of luxuries. Many of them have been about the most presumptuous thieves that have ever breathed. When a man kills thousands of his fellow men he is called a hero, and his praises are sung by the bells and trumpets of the kingdom, but when he kills one he has the privilege of shaking hands with the hangman and of feeling the rope rather tightly round his neck."

The "Baner," December 21st, 1887.

(This article deals with the formation of the Land Trade and Labour League.)

"Formation of Land Trade and Labour League. The League of those oppressed by the Tithe has determined to widen the sphere of its operations, and consequently it was thought better to change its name as it appears above. The objects of the League are: (1) A more just arrangement for determining the amount of tithe; and to continue, as before, to assist those oppressed by the tithe; (2) The disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England in Wales, and the transfer of all its revenues to national pur-

poses ; (3) Reform in laws relating to land, building leases, royalties on collieries, mines, &c., in the Game Laws, Fishing Laws, and in all other laws relating to land, that are not beneficial to the prosperity of the country and its inhabitants ; (4) To elect Members of Parliament who understand the needs of the farmers, tradesmen, and workmen of the kingdom, and to get assistance from the National Treasury to support them. To carry out the objects of the League a large sum of money is necessary, and since the League considers the above questions of national importance, it appeals with every confidence to all who approve of its objects, and urgently requests contributions to its funds, which may be sent direct to the treasurer, Mr. Thomas Gee, of Denbigh, or they may be paid at any of the branches of the North and South Wales Bank, Limited, or the National Provincial Bank, Limited, from where they will be forwarded to the account of the treasurer of the League at Denbigh, and will be duly acknowledged. A copy of the constitution, rules, &c., of the League will be sent for 1½*d.* by the financial secretary."

In 1888 the confessions of failure are such as almost to excite compassion ; the reproaches addressed to the farmers for their "servility," which was at least capable of interpretation as lack of interest in Mr. Gee's scheme, become more bitter ; and the passages amounting to invitation to crime become more conspicuous. To them may be appended the extracts from two copies of the *Baner* in 1889, and finally the betrayal of the rottenness of the whole scheme by Dr. Pan Jones, who, actuated by what motives we know not, revealed the secrets of the successive leagues and their utter failure to attract the popular mind. £62 13*s.* 2*d.* in three years—that is the enthusiastic desire of the Welsh farmer for the reform of the law of tenancy converted into pounds, shillings and pence.

The "Baner," April 25th, 1888.

"How many landlords also are acting upon the same principle? The majority of them (*i.e.*, *landlords*) live in England, and the poor Welsh, through the sweat of their brows, are collecting every halfpenny in the neighbourhood for them to have the pleasure of spending them in England or on the Continent. Remember that the above are facts and not groundless dreams; our country is in a truly serious state, and we ought to acknowledge gratefully the services of the Liberal Press, and the *Baner* particularly, for bringing our cause before the world."

* * * * *

The "Baner," September 26th, 1888.

"And we should also have a new land measure instead of the present disgraceful oppression, that is like a plague consuming the strength of our country, and instead of our farmers being like slaves, being compelled to give more than all their earnings to their landowners and those living on delicacies, fatness, and splendour, in baronial palaces, quite regardless of the sweat on the face of the sons of toil, and the hard corns that are on the mighty hands of the children of the soil."

* * * * *

The "Baner," September 26th, 1888.

"It is very little that I have read these last weeks on the Land League in the *Baner*. Surely not too much can be written on the subject. 'Many a knock breaks the stone.' Quite true, but many a double knock is required to break the prejudice of the farmers and shopkeepers also about the League. They are as dull as moles. There are many of my brethren the farmers spending sixpence or ninepence for

tobacco, but a penny or two for a newspaper they consider too much. Poor fellows! I know of some farmers they must have two, three, or four to buy the *Baner* [*i.e.*, *combine in bodies of two, three, or four.*] They are capital smokers for all that, and all ending in smoke. But if a good newspaper was bought, such paper would bring some blessing with it, both to them and their children. And we would have better hope for success to the League. The League is progressing in this neighbourhood, but not fast enough. Those who believe in it should induce others to join them. If what I have heard concerning some farmers is true, it is a great shame. Some run after a farm when the tenant has given notice in order to get a reduction. The Irish in their rags are better people than us, as true as bread is in a loaf. Shame to the grasshoppers, I say."

* * * * *

The "Baner," October 10th, 1888.

"Secondly, the agricultural class, of all classes, reads least newspapers. Perhaps the hard times, scarcity of money, and want of time have a deal to do in this matter. Our farmers will not spend a penny a week for a newspaper as they consider that waste, and it is looked upon as a penny given away for nothing! When many a penny is spent by the tin-workers and colliers of Glamorgan, Monmouth, and Carmarthen, and the quarrymen of Carnarvonshire and Merionethshire, and by the artisans of all kinds. But the poor farmer; he does not feel that he can spare a penny a week! Very few in comparison are received of any newspapers in the rural districts [*i.e.*, *very few newspapers are taken*], to what could be and ought to be received."

* * * * *

He continues to say: "I believe the circulation of the two *Baners* is great from the fact that their influence is so considerable. The name of their able editor creates alarm through

the foreign Church's camp, and especially amongst its officers—the persons who get the fat of the tithe—getting hundreds and thousands annually for doing almost nothing. Thirdly, there is no class so unadventurous and cowardly as our farmers. They bear everything from the agents that no one else would do, so appropriate are those words of the prophet to the farmers of Wales, ‘As sheep to the slaughter they were led, and as lambs in the presence of their shearers are dumb, so they open not their mouths.’”

* * * * *

The “Baner,” February 10th, 1889.

* * * * *

“A great number of persons believed that the aristocracy was one of the essentials of life, and that if the aristocracy was lost, peace also would be lost from the country, and life certainly become a failure. While people were consoling themselves with these reflections, the sick were getting worse. *At that time a letter would be occasionally sent from the office of Dr. Gee, Dr. E. Pan Jones, and Dr. M. D. Jones—three old experienced doctors who have spent years in the study of aristocracy. In those letters they called the attention of the people to the state of the aristocracy in Wales. It was little notice their letters received for years.*”

The “Baner,” October 12th, 1889.

“There is a terrible feeling in the neighbourhood of Prion about P——. This farm is to let, and a good and respectable man applied for it, with a reduction in the previous rent, but while negotiation was proceeding another well-known man came forward and offered four pounds more than the previous rent for it. This latter is a prominent man in the parish, but it is considered an extremely shameful act to *raise* rent against a neighbour. One farmer, the other night, regretted

that this person was not in Ireland, that the Irish are more plucky than the Welsh when such foul play takes place."—This effusion is signed by "Humphrey the Poacher."

The "Baner," October 30th, 1889.

* * * * *

"It is plain to every man who is possessed of any common sense, that if disestablishment and disendowment were obtained, it would lighten to some extent the demands that are upon the tenants. But many of the landowners must be too dull to see a thing so evident, and they are so foolish as to be led by their 'tails'* against their tenants—the men who are doing their best towards supporting them. The existence of an Established Church is at the root of all this. The Established Church is a greater curse in Wales than is known to any one. Hence arises the coolness and disagreement between the landowners and the tenants these years. What is the reason but that for widows and others in some counties getting notice to quit? And it is said that blacklegs from the neighbourhood have been so inhuman as to take their homes from above their heads. Many things of this kind are carried on these years. Boycotting from all directions is carried on, and not the farmers only are boycotted, but Nonconformists in general—tradesmen, artisans, and workmen of all kinds and degrees. There is nothing too low and inhuman for the Tories and parsons to do in the way of boycotting the Dissenters and the Liberals. It appears that the landlords (English mostly) and the parsons have leagued together to stamp Dissent out of the country if they can. It

* The expression "tails" requires a passing explanation. In full it is *cynffoner*, and the word may be taken to express the extremity of loathing and contempt. Literally it is based upon a shockingly bad translation of English, for strictly it means "tail-bearer," but the Welsh use it as if it meant "tale-bearer." Perhaps "toady" is its nearest equivalent in English.

may be supposed that the great sin of the Welsh, in the opinion of that class, is going to the chapels."

* * * * *

In the *Baner* of November 20th, 1889, is an article headed "To arms ! To arms !!"—

"'To arms ! To arms !!' is the cry heard from afar, and if there be any foundation for what is published these days as to the conduct of landowners and clergymen in Wales, no doubt this cry will get louder and louder continually until it resounds through the Principality and every other place where Dissenters are located. If it be found that circumstances call for the national newspapers of Wales to join in the shout 'To arms !' we believe the nation will rise as one man in obedience to the call and that all will be ready for the battle.

* * * * *

And if the landowners and clergy are for boycotting care will be taken to pick up the glove at once, and fight the battle in earnest. There is mention made of behaving towards some as if towards leprosy ; perhaps the Welsh can show the meaning of Mr. Gladstone's words when he refers to a people's right as to 'exclusive dealing'—to deal with whom they please."

Finally, in an instructive article, which can only be accounted for by the saying "When rogues fall out, &c.," Dr. Pan Jones, the well-known land nationaliser, exposed the whole affair in *Y Celt*, of February 27th, 1890. This article is written by Dr. E. Pan Jones, and is as follows :—

"Probably no such wavering has been witnessed during the centuries of Christendom as took place in the history of the *Baner* during the last ten years, and still during these

years of inconsistency and instability, Mr. Gee will have us believe that its education on all subjects is like that of an infallible oracle and everybody was expected to say 'Abreck' before it."

* * * * *

"Time, space, and words will not allow me to particularise on the wavering of the *Baner* in its various connections since the days of the American War, I shall merely confine myself to its wavering with its recent political leagues.

"Mr. Gee's League No. 1.—The first was the Denbighshire and Flintshire Farmers' League, which was to bring the landlords into order, bring them to obey the law issued from Denbigh, and by fair promises he succeeded to enchant and entice many of the Vale of Clwyd farmers to the belief that he was *somebody*. That League was to reduce rents, secure perpetual tenancy for farmers, and give them privileges compared with which the blessings of the Irish three F's were nothing better than child's-play. These prospects were set forth in colours more brilliant than those of the rainbow. He describes those blessings as things which, if not actually attained, were available at any time. The meetings of the League were held alternately at Denbigh, Rhyl, and Holywell, to which none were allowed admission, except simple and credulous farmers.

* * * * *

"Mr. Gee's League 2.—This was called Land League. It was admitted that the first had failed, and must be removed to make room for the second.

* * * * *

"Mr. Gee's League 3.—The Anti-tithe League. This League was not in the design at the beginning—this grew out of the failure of previous Leagues, as D. Roberts says, and we would never have heard of this had the others succeeded.

* * * * *

"Mr. Gee's League 4.—Farmers, Tradesmen, and Work-

men's League. They began to feel that it was impossible to proceed without the masses. It was asked at the meetings at Denbigh and at Rhyl, whether the workmen were to have fixity of tenure as well as the farmers, that his house and garden were so important to the labourer as the farm is to the farmer, that the farmers by employing machines, and by cultivating less of their lands, are able to do with less workmen than formerly, and in their greed for more land, that they often push the workmen away, demolish their dwellings in order to have gardens to their tenements. No, nothing of the kind. In view of these things, I desire simply to ask Mr. Gee, or Mr. D. Roberts, who bears Mr. Gee's shields, what part or portion is there for tradesmen and workmen in the one or the other of the Denbigh Leagues? They are welcome to shout hurrah, to give their vote when an election comes, to buy the *Baner*, and subscribe towards the expenses, but is there any tendency in one of the Denbigh Leagues to afford a remedy to any beside the farmers?

"Thus Mr. Gee has been throughout the years, hatching on leagues, baptising and burying them [*'hatching on': i.e., 'hatching out.'*] It is a pity to see the people, many of them poor, kept in ceaseless agitation until after wearing out their strength pecuniarily and temporarily [*i.e., until they have worn out*], and by then behold the League vanishing like smoke under our hands, a new League again commencing, that again vanishing, and so on until the people are like sheep without a shepherd. Here they are now after ten years of wild goose chase, without having as much as a sparrow of blessing gained. The pockets of the people have got considerably lighter, but the *Baner* has sold well, and very likely has a quiet conscience."

* * * * *

The *Baner* was and is the more important paper: but its contemporaries were not left behind in the race. Thus a

reference to the *Herald Cymraeg* of May 17th, 1887, shows an invitation to "boycott" "landgrabbers." The *Genedl*, in successive passages cited by Lord Penrhyn, sounds a trumpet call to the "heedless" nation, urges the adoption of Irish methods, rebukes the "spiritless timid ones, ignorant, fearful—yes, and worse than all, traitorous" and so forth.

Lord Penrhyn's evidence was confined in the main to extracts showing conclusively the desperate efforts made by the Welsh Press to create a Land Question for its own purposes. He did not go out of his way to select passages remarkable for extravagance of language amounting almost to criminality, of which passages there is an abundant crop, and it were wrong to leave the English reader to believe that the violent sentences which come incidentally in the course of articles selected from another point of view could be taken as a fair sample of what the Welsh Press can achieve in the way of ferocity when, as they say on the Turf, it is extended. The Welsh journalist can do better than this by a long way; he can indeed rival the mild Hindoo at his best; but even this little sample will probably satisfy the English reader and will serve to give him some insight into the influences which are at work in Wales.

Lord Penrhyn went on to say that in 1891 *Y Werin*, an exceedingly virulent journal, *Y Genedl*, and the *North Wales Observer and Express* (published in English) had passed into the hands of the Welsh National Press Company, the articles of association being signed by the following persons:—Thomas E. Ellis, M.P., Samuel T. Evans, M.P., Alfred Thomas, M.P., William Abraham, M.P., D. Lloyd George, M.P., David Randell, M.P., Evan Jones (who subsequently became M.P.), and that Mr. Stuart Rendel, M.P. (now Lord Rendel) was a shareholder; and he concluded by saying "of the scurrilous personalities which, for the purpose of creating ill-feeling against landlords, have been made use of in these journals since they became the property of the new

company, I will say no more at present than that, if I were to read the report of some of them to the Commission, I feel sure that they would be pronounced to be as discreditable to journalism as they are false in their statements."

While attention is still fixed upon the peculiar methods and sinister policy of Welsh journalism it is interesting to note in the official minutes that attempts were made at the outset, even by some of the Commissioners, to establish a theory that the responsibility of the proprietor and editor of a newspaper was of different degree in the case of a letter or signed article and in that of a leading article respectively. Mr. Gee himself took this line of defence when confronted by Lord Kenyon (who certainly has inherited powers of cross-examining in polished and effective style) with sundry other passages from the *Baner*. But his defence was quite unsubstantial. True it is, of course, that the uninvited correspondents of newspapers will, on occasion, commit themselves to expressions of opinion which are simply brainless; true also that editors sometimes seek to protect themselves by disclaiming all responsibility for "opinions" expressed by amateur correspondents. But in the first place we are not dealing here with amateur correspondence, but, in the case of the series in the *Baner* entitled "The Eagle's Nest," with a systematic succession of long articles in epistolary form which, whether paid for or not, must clearly have been planned between the editor and the contributor; and in the second place we are not dealing, exclusively at any rate, with merely silly expressions of opinion. To advise that such and such men be "boycotted," or "treated as lepers" is, no doubt, to express an opinion that such treatment ought to be measured out to them. But it is also something more; it is a distinct invitation to ignorant persons to commit that which the law of this country justly recognises as a crime, as an offence against the social order. To allow amateur correspondents to do this, as Mr. Gee did, time after time, involved beyond question the acceptance of

a moral responsibility quite equal to the legal responsibility which was undoubtedly incurred. Besides the defence turned out to be worth little, if anything, even if its fundamental principle had been recognised ; for, while Mr. Gee was giving his voluminous evidence, there was ample time to turn up the files of the *Baner* newspaper, and the result of the investigation, which was duly placed in evidence before the Commissioners, was to show that the editorial articles exhibited to Mr. Gee by Lord Kenyon and others, together with those which Lord Penrhyn had placed upon the record of evidence, were about equal in number to those which, so far as form of printing went, appeared to come from correspondents.

So much for the purely journalistic side of the agitation. It had also a political side which took visible form in the shape of a pamphlet written at the request of and published by the South Wales Liberal Federation in 1887 or thereabouts. The author was one "Adfyfr"—at any rate such was his Bardic name—in common life he was called Hughes : and Mr. Stuart Rendel, M.P. (now Lord Rendel), added an appendix. The appendix, which consisted of the merest rhodomontade, need give us no more trouble than it gave to its illustrious author.

"Adfyfr's" pamphlet was characterised by almost criminal vehemence of language. On his very first page the author wrote :

"It is useless and worse than useless to try and stifle the bitter cry of agricultural workers. If a remedy is not provided for its wrongs there must of necessity be reprisal. How can there be peace where there is no peace? The Welsh aspect of the Land Question cannot be dallied and trifled with without danger. It is about the most urgent question of the day, and *unless it is equitably settled it will also speedily become the one question of the night.*"

The italics, which were not inserted by "Adfyfr," mark a passage of striking violence and susceptible of but one interpretation. But apart from its vehemence the pamphlet was but a poor production. It disappointed even Mr. Stuart Rendel, who played the part of godfather: for Mr. Rendel no doubt looked for argument, and evidence, and figures, but found them not; so he could say no more in ushering the pamphlet into the world than "I am glad to see that you have brought to your aid that which is so often wiser than learning and sounder than logic—real human sympathy."

In fact, the pamphlet contained the largest possible admixtures of mere vulgar abuse with the most infinitesimal amount of direct statement. Where specific cases were cited the names and the very localities were suppressed. Thus "Adfyfr" begins an allegation of hardship in these words: "Ll—— is situated on one of the largest estates in North Wales." A moment's thought reminds us of Llanfair, Llanfair-is-gaer, Llandudno, Llandulas, Llanerchymedd, Llanfair-ynghornwy, Llanfair Caereinion, Llandygwinning, Llanbabo, Llangristiolas, Llanfihangel and so forth *ad infinitum*. For "Llan," means primarily "enclosure," and then "church," and is the commonest prefix to a place-name in the Welsh language. Moreover, this particular letter "Ll" (for it is one letter in Welsh and not two) may stand in a place-name before every vowel, *i.e.*, a, e, i, o, u, w, y, and each of the twenty-two diphthongs in the Welsh language. Whether any of the seventeen triphthongs would carry it may be doubtful. The search, therefore, after the definite in Mr. Hughes's compilation was complicated by considerable difficulties; but it was pursued with great patience by the late Mr. George Owen, with the result that, where the allegations could be localised and where their reference to this or that individual could be followed, they were completely disproved. The results of Mr. Owen's labours were published *sub titulo* "Tenancy in Wales" in 1889.

“Adfyfr” also tried what could be effected by the introduction of religious prejudice; dilating at length upon the fact that a large number of chapel sites were held on long leases only. A reference to a table included in the appendix, and extracted from the official evidence given before the Commission, will show that the vast majority of these sites were and are held at purely nominal ground-rents. When it is added, from information in the possession of the Association, that the oldest chapel in Bangor was in 1889 a stable, and that one chapel on the Dolwyddelen estate, having then at least fifty years of a lease to run, had become an assembly-room, and that the vestry-room and house had been let as ordinary cottages, it will be clear that, even with the utmost generosity on the part of landlords, there is need for caution. No sanctity attaches to these buildings. Thus the writer, when holding an inquiry for the Charity Commission into the affairs of the Corporation of Nevin (extinguished by the Municipal Corporations Act of 1883), had to report upon the feelings of the burgesses with regard to the use which might be made of an old and disused chapel which formed part of the corporate property. In reply to a question he was distinctly informed that it might be put to any secular use. Indeed, it was proposed to convert it into a wash-house. It follows then that landowners might reasonably fight shy of granting for religious uses *in perpetuum*, and at cheap rates, sites which might at any time be converted to purely secular and commercial purposes. That they have not done so is, perhaps, to the credit of their hearts rather than their heads; and their thanks are indirectly due to “Adfyfr” and to one or two erratic witnesses before the Commission who gave them the opportunity of stating their case. That probably was not the intention of either “Adfyfr” or the witnesses.

Nor did the pamphlet and the vernacular newspaper satisfy the party of agitation. In the House of Commons where, in pursuit of the really desirable object that members should

speak the truth without fear, a speaker enjoys absolute privilege from the law of defamation, Mr. Thomas Ellis, the member for Merionethshire, and the most prominent and accomplished of the agitators upon the Land Question, deliberately made the following statement concerning the late Lord Penrhyn :

“In regard to the question of pasturage, too, the rights of the peasantry have been invaded. In his evidence Lord Penrhyn admitted that considerable difficulty had arisen in his district, owing to the fact that the pasturage of the tenants had been inclosed. In the assertion of their rights the tenants had taken down the fences, and what did Lord Penrhyn do? He used his power as Chairman of Quarter Sessions, if I remember rightly, to obtain a special *posse* of police for the district, and he levied a special rate to bring to submission these farmers who asserted their rights.”

Now it has been pointed out to Mr. Ellis over and over again, in public correspondence and otherwise, that this passage bristles with mis-statements, due let us hope to inadequate information obtained by hearsay upon a subject of which he could have no personal knowledge. Notwithstanding this, and although some of the facts upon which he had been misinformed, and had, therefore, misled the public, were easy of ascertainment, Mr. Ellis (Q. 17,084 and thereabouts) repeated the substance of his accusation, withdrawing only the assertion that Lord Penrhyn had “used his power as Chairman of Quarter Sessions” (which he never was, as is hereafter shown) for the purpose alleged. Stimulated by a suggestive question from Professor Rhys, one of the Commissioners, this Member of Parliament then stigmatised the conduct of the late Lord Penrhyn as “infamous”; and the audience, composed largely of those students of Bala College who, having received a holiday in order that they might

listen to the champion of liberty, had not chosen the better part of a day's fishing, applauded; nor did the grave and reverend Commissioners rebuke the outburst. Let us pass from this to the point at which the statements of Mr. Ellis were examined and contradicted at Llangefni by Mr. Beaver Roberts who, having been solicitor to the landowners in the parishes affected who caused the Enclosure Act to be passed, had an advantage over Mr. Ellis in that he knew what he was talking about. He showed (Q. 23,016 *et seq.*), that the late Lord Penrhyn, then Colonel Douglas Pennant, had not been one of these landowners, had no connection with the application for enclosure, had not been Chairman of Quarter Sessions, had not brought the matter before Quarter Sessions, and so forth. He then used towards the assertions of Mr. Ellis the same word "infamous," which Mr. Ellis had applied to the conduct of Lord Penrhyn as described by him in terms absolutely incorrect. And straightway Lord Carrington, who was in the chair, requested Mr. Beaver Roberts to withdraw the word "infamous," which Mr. Ellis had used unrebuked amid the applause of the gallery, on the ground that the Commission was very anxious that violent language should be omitted.

The history of this particular charge, of the wholesale fashion in which it was disproved, of the manner in which the Commission, acting instinctively, so to speak, and on the spur of the moment, treated two identical expressions of opinion is instructive. It shows the recklessness with which the leaders of the party of agitation hurl at landowners statements capable of complete disproof in detail; and it tends farther to show in advance—the point belongs more particularly to a later period of this volume—the difficulties with which witnesses favourable to the existing laws and system of land tenure had to contend in giving before the Commission that testimony which they offered as of grace and without any compulsion.

A very flagrant case, also, in which an attempt was made, primarily by outside agitators and for purely or impurely political purposes, to make a grievance out of an ordinary transaction, was that of one David Evans of Cae Einion, who gave evidence before the Commission (Q. 8589 *et seq.*). The flimsy character of the allegations made originally against the landlord, Mr. Ellis Nanney, and his agent, Mr. W. B. C. Jones, has however been so completely exposed in the public press, the accusations have been so severely condemned by the *Cambrian News*, a journal certainly not favourable to landowners, and the whole of the miserable charge has been so thoroughly dissipated by Mr. Walter Jones in an able and outspoken pamphlet entitled the "Cae Einion Farce," that the matter would not be worth referring to but for two facts.

Firstly, the main allegation, after the witness had gone through the stock story of grievances, was that the witness had received notice to quit either because he was a member of the Welsh Land League, or for political reasons. This main allegation was dragged out of the witness by some questions (8641 to 8643) of Mr. Commissioner Griffiths and by a series of eminently leading questions addressed to him by Mr. Commissioner Brynmor Jones. A very few words from the agent, who was severely harried by the chairman for expressing the opinion that friendship with a landlord and membership of the Welsh Land League were things incompatible with one another, disposed of the whole story: and the man must have known it would be disposed of. Mr. Walter Jones produced a copy (Q. 8716) of a letter addressed by him to sixty tenants, of whom Mr. Evans was one, who received notice to quit at the same time. That notice to quit, as the letter explained, was given all round and certainly with no political object (for several of the recipients were Conservatives). It was given simply in order to pave the way for a new agreement under which the landlord was to pay the tithe instead of the tenant. Other circumstances

appear in the evidence, but they are immaterial to the present issue and to the present purpose, which is to show that the letter received by the tenant, in common with fifty-nine others, not only made no mention of politics but also made it as clear as daylight that the notice to quit was merely formal and was merely the preliminary to a new agreement.

Finally be it said that the purpose of this chapter will have been accomplished if it has succeeded in conveying even a vague impression of some of the incidents which have accompanied the rising of the Welsh Land Question, of the various forces that have been at work, of the character of the agitation, of the class of charge which is made against Welsh landowners, individually and generally, and of the quality of the evidence upon which such charges are founded. It will be necessary, in the course of this task, to pay detailed attention to some of the charges made before the Commission itself. For the present nothing more is desired than to show the influences which were brought to bear upon the public mind long before there was so much as a thought in the minds of the party of agitation that a Commission was likely to be appointed.

CHAPTER II.

Formation of North Wales Property Defence Association—its object—not hostile to Farmers—it asks for a Commission in April 1892—Mr. T. E. Ellis's Speech of May 1892—His Indictment—Mr. Gladstone's Observations upon it—Mr. Chaplin's Criticism—Mr. Gladstone's Snowdon Speech—His Statistics—the Inaccuracy of Inferences drawn from them—the Irrelevance of any Inference from them.

THERE comes a time when human power of enduring in silence, or something approaching to it, venomous insult and continuous calumny, is strained to the breaking point. That time came, in the case of the landowners of North Wales, or at any rate of the more considerable members of that body, in April 1892. Among the landowners of South Wales there was, at that time, no organisation; but the landowners of North Wales, who, by reason of the greater acuteness of the tithe question and the greater influence of the vernacular press in their districts, had been forced by circumstances to stand in the forefront of the battle, were already formed into a defensive association, and had been so formed since 1886. The object of the Association was defined with admirable precision in a circular issued after the original meeting in December of that year (Lord Penrhyn's evidence at Llangefni, 22,781), of which the material words are appended:

“The meeting expressed the utmost sympathy and good feeling towards the tenant farmer, and it was agreed that landowners should meet their tenants fairly and liberally in

the existing depression of their business, and an opinion prevailed that, if allowed to arrange their own affairs, no difficulties would arise. At the same time it was felt by all that the incessant interference of outside agitators, often totally unconnected with any interest in land, and the open encouragement given by a large portion of the Welsh press to schemes practically of confiscation, made imperative the establishment of an organisation for mutual self-protection.

“It was therefore resolved (with only two dissentients) to establish this Association, which it must be clearly understood is formed in no hostile spirit, nor *as a combination against the tenant farmers in any shape or form.*”

It may be observed that one of the questions in the official syllabus distinctly suggests the existence of a combination of the character repudiated by the italicised words: and that there is absolutely no evidence of the existence of such a body in Wales. Whence then came the idea underlying the Question?

It is enough to say that the Association received annually increasing support from the landowners of North Wales independently of politics; that it kept a close watch, as it was entitled to, upon the progress of agitation; that it promoted the feeling that the interests of landlord and tenant were identical so far as opposition went to the movements of agitators who had their own axes to grind.

It was in April 1892, that the Association, stung by the scurrilous abuse to which its members were subject in the vernacular press and in Parliament, resolved to approach Lord Salisbury's Administration of that date with a request for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The terms of the resolution in which the determination to court investigation was expressed were the following:

“That this Association considers that the time has arrived for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into

the relations between landowners and tenants in Wales, in consequence of the grave charges brought forward, in the press and in Parliament, against owners of land in the Principality, and that the Government be requested to take steps for the appointment of such a Commission at the earliest possible opportunity."

Lord Salisbury's Administration, however, had at that time nearly reached the limit of its tenure of power and, probably for that reason, the request, which was made with all due formality in accordance with the resolution, was not successful. The circumstances which led to the making of the request were, in the first place, to be found in a righteous resentment against the foul abuse which filled the columns of the vernacular press, and in the second place in a just and prudent apprehension that this abuse, unless its falsity were demonstrated officially (which could not be done unless an official opportunity was granted), could hardly fail to produce an injurious and misleading effect upon persons compelled, to a large extent, to draw their information concerning the progress of events from the corrupt columns of the vernacular press.

The *causa proxima*, however, the match which lighted the fire, was no doubt the long speech made by Mr. Thomas Ellis—a speech to which passing allusion was made in the foregoing chapter—in the House of Commons on March 16, 1892; that is to say about a month before the resolution itself was passed. Inasmuch as Mr. Ellis objects to the *Times* report of that speech, which on *prima facie* grounds may be taken to represent what he did say actually with more merciless accuracy than the report in Hansard which, having been revised by him (see marginal note in the *Parliamentary Debates*), no doubt represents what he would like to have said, we will take Hansard as the basis of our analysis of his oration. Its main points were these :

(1) Mr. Ellis complained of the scantiness of the information at the disposal of Parliament on the ground that the Richmond Commission contained no Welsh member, called little Welsh evidence, and employed as Assistant Commissioner Mr. Doyle, who knew no Welsh and made no "pretence or semblance of obtaining evidence from the tenantry." Subsequent correspondence seems to have directed the attention of Mr. Ellis to Mr. Doyle's report, a most elaborate and valuable document, full of testimony to pains taken, and replete with valuable suggestions, insomuch that Mr. Ellis actually quoted, in his evidence before the Welsh Land Commission, the authority of the man of whose method of obtaining information he had said, in 1892, "it cannot be said to have afforded much assistance to the House." But whether Mr. Ellis was or was not unjust to the memory of Mr. Doyle really matters but little.

(2) Mr. Ellis observed that Colonel Cornwallis West and Mr. Stuart Rendel, now Lord Rendel, had asked in 1888 for a Commission of Inquiry, but that the "Government of Tory landlords" had refused to grant it. Well, they did the same, when the Welsh landowners themselves asked for an inquiry in 1892; but it is certainly clear that the Welsh landowners courted inquiry at all times.

(3) He went on to say that the relations between landlord and tenant, in England and Wales respectively, differed because the Welsh landowners and their tenants differed in language, religion, and politics. There are really two propositions here, of which the first divides itself into three sub-propositions, viz., that landowners and tenants differ on these three points. The second asserts that these differences have a practical influence on the relation of landowner and tenant. Of the three sub-propositions embodied in the first statement no one is absolutely true, but each contains a larger proportion of truth than of inaccuracy. The second and more important assertion has no substantial foundation in fact.

(4) He went on to say that tenancy by agreement had taken the place of tenancy by custom in Wales. He omitted to say that the same process of development has been going on in England, and that customs, having all the force of law, still prevail in parts of Wales. In Glamorganshire, for example, custom of a highly beneficial character has rendered the Agricultural Holdings Acts of 1875 and 1883 a dead letter to the mutual benefit of both parties to the contract of tenancy. (See the Glamorganshire evidence *passim*.)

(5) He alleged that the practice of permitting a tenancy to descend from father to son had fallen into disuse; for contradiction of which see the North Wales evidence in innumerable cases, many of them collected in this volume.

(6) He alleged infatuated land-hunger.

(7) He spoke, without specific reference, of a tenant who had been compelled by his landlord to have a poaching dog shot: of which it is to be observed that a reference which is not specific cannot be accepted for the simple reason that the statement cannot be tested, and the character of the evidence on which it is based cannot be known.

(8) He made the accusation against the late Lord Penrhyn mentioned, and exploded, in the foregoing chapter.

(9) He quoted, without specific reference and with profuse statements that the landlord in each case had spent nothing for 100 years or thereabouts—Mr. Ellis was born in 1859—anonymously in the “Adfyfr” style of rent raised on tenants’ improvements. All the cases so quoted were absolutely vague, and can be tested in no known way.

(10) He “ventured to say that with regard to the vast mass of the permanent improvements on the agricultural land in Wales, including drainage, fencing, and those long and dismal lines of stone walls to be seen in many parts of Wales, the reclamation of waste and marsh manuring, chalking (this by the way is nonsense, since there is no chalk in Wales) the

land, I say the mass—the overwhelming mass—is effected by the tenants in Wales.”

This sweeping assertion, an assertion which is not backed by a single specific instance in his speech, is the most important statement made by Mr. Ellis; it is really the main count in the indictment laid against Welsh landowners, and it is the count which they claim to have disposed of absolutely and beyond all possibility of doubt by the voluminous evidence given before the Welsh Land Commission.

(11) Mr. Ellis attempted to compare the rise and fall of rental in England and Wales respectively for a period of seventy-five years—namely, from the end of the Napoleonic wars up to the year 1890. The basis of the calculations in which Mr. Ellis revelled were the income-tax returns under Schedule B. With this attempt at comparison and its irrelevance to the question before the House, it will be more convenient to deal almost at once since the same argument, in a far more business-like form, was used by Mr. Gladstone in a subsequent speech.

Upon these allegations, added to an assertion that the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 was a dismal failure, a fiery attack upon the penal clauses in agreements of tenancy, and upon the Game Laws, Mr. Ellis asked the House to sanction a Land Bill embodying the appointment of a Commission of three men empowered, *inter alia*, to fix the conditions of tenure and to fix a “fair rent” at the application of either party to the contract of tenancy. In fact, Mr. Ellis desired to establish the three F’s.

The Bill was severely criticised in debate, and some of the remarks of Mr. Gladstone upon it are worthy of remembrance.

“The ground on which I am unable to vote for the Bill is that, in my opinion, the question raised by my hon. friend is not ripe for a definitive solution such as is proposed by the Bill now before Parliament.

“The claims of the Welsh farmer cannot possibly depend on

the question whether he is a Liberal and Nonconformist or a Conservative and Churchman."

Finally, and at great length, Mr. Gladstone declared that, greatly as he had been impressed by the speech which he heard, he could not feel that, in the absence of official inquiry, it afforded sufficient ground for "the adoption of measures fundamentally altering the relations of all land contracts in Wales."

In fact, Mr. Gladstone then suggested the appointment of a Royal Commission. Mr. Abel Thomas (East Carmarthen-shire) accepted, so to speak, Mr. Gladstone's offer, speaking on behalf of Welsh Radicals, adding: "We are not afraid of such an inquiry; and if it is not granted I hope the House will draw the inference that it is the other side who are afraid of it."

Colonel Cornwallis West (West Denbighshire) took up Mr. Ellis's challenge warmly, made just complaint of the extravagant and indefinite character of his charges, avowed the willingness and absolute desire of landowners to face an impartial inquiry, and spoke indignantly of the confiscatory principle which was the underlying foundation of the Bill. Various speeches followed, but the most important of them was that delivered by Mr. Chaplin, who spoke, undoubtedly, upon the basis of a knowledge of agriculture far superior to that possessed by any other member who had attracted the Speaker's eye in the course of the debate.

Without pausing to consider the basis of the figures used by Mr. Ellis—members of the House of Commons, like other men, are frequently misled by the bold statement that certain statistics relate to certain facts, when in truth they do not represent those facts—Mr. Chaplin went straight to the point. Whether the percentage of increase was great or small mattered, Mr. Chaplin as a practical agriculturist saw clearly, little or nothing. "The House must remember that

where the great fall of rents has occurred in England, has been in the great corn-growing districts of the country—in Lincolnshire, Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk, and in the Eastern counties generally, which are chiefly devoted to corn-growing. . . .” “In Wales a comparatively small amount of corn is grown, and it is quite sufficient to account for the difference in the character of the fall in rents.”

He went on to point out that the prevalence of small holdings in Wales, alleged truthfully by one at least of the supporters of the Bill, necessarily involved higher rentals than in districts where large holdings were customary, because of the extra expenditure on buildings. In conclusion, Mr. Chaplain adjured “members of this House, in whatever quarter they may sit, to take their stand on sound and honest principles and reject by a sufficient and, I hope, a significant majority what I can only characterise as a mischievous, utterly unprincipled and wholly uncalled-for measure.”

The House took Mr. Chaplin’s advice and an amendment that the Bill be read a second time “six months hence” was carried by 234 to 113.

A month or two later, in pursuance of the resolution of the North Wales Property Defence Association which has been quoted—a resolution passed before Mr. Ellis made his speech—formal application for the appointment of a Royal Commission was made; which by the way was a crushing answer to the unworthy taunt of the member of Parliament who had (*vide supra*) asked the House, if a Commission were not appointed, to draw the inference that it was because “the other side” were afraid. That the request was not successful was, perhaps, to be regretted; but in any case it was no fault of Welsh landlords.

In the autumn of that year, the hands which held the reins of power having been changed in the meanwhile, Mr. Gladstone delivered his famous speech on the slopes of Snowdon. The speech, which naturally attracted a good deal

of public attention, was very different in tone from that which he had made in the House of Commons. But that is a small matter. Men who know this world have learned to expect in outdoor speeches of politicians anything rather than moderation and impartiality of tone, and they are well aware that many valuable if unostentatious things must be sacrificed if the passion for vote-catching is to be indulged to the top of its bent. Upon that point, therefore, suffice it to say that if "the voice that breathed o'er" Snowdon—Eden would hardly be the right word—was the voice of Gladstone, the words were the words of Ellis. But after a while Mr. Gladstone escaped from Mr. Ellis and his leading-strings. For a comparison between the rise and fall of rents in England and Wales respectively he had accepted, in the House of Commons, the basis of returns under Schedule B relied upon by Mr. Ellis. In the interval he appeared to have come to the conclusion that there was something rotten in that state of argument, and to have taken refuge in a special extract from the returns under Schedule A, under the heading "Lands." Of the two bases, that chosen by a speaker of Mr. Gladstone's financial experience would *prima facie* be expected to be the more trustworthy; and so in fact it was, but that it was not entirely trustworthy, that conclusions based upon it depended upon quite unwarrantable assumptions regarding unknown quantities, was soon demonstrated in the course of a correspondence between Mr. Gladstone and the late Mr. George Owen (then Secretary of the North Wales Property Defence Association) which was published in the *Times* newspaper.

The particulars of that correspondence, which amounts to a precise summary of the argument against the inference which Mr. Gladstone drew from statistics, the said argument and correspondence having been given in evidence before the Welsh Land Commission, will be found in the appendix since, partly because, as Mr. Chaplin said, the inferences from statistics, if accurate, would be absolutely irrelevant, it is not

deemed necessary to cumber the text with them. But it is interesting to note some points in the correspondence, including some serious admissions by Mr. Gladstone, and to observe farther how closely an intelligent study of the figures supports the practical and straightforward points made, on the spur of the moment, by Mr. Chaplin.

And first—to use a Baconian opening for a sentence—let us refer to Mr. Gladstone's letter of October 17, 1892. Asked to justify the figures which he had used in his Snowdon speech, Mr. Gladstone answered, through his Secretary, Mr. Murray, that

(1) Even after search he had been unable to find the figures supplied to him ;

(2) He had obtained a fresh return which did not tally exactly with the figures which he had used before ;

(3) The case looked worse on the figures which he had obtained since than it had looked before and that “he will be very glad if any authentic arguments can be adduced to give it a more favourable aspect.” (Note that in this Pharisaical observation the word “authentic” is used in a sense which is childishly erroneous.) Then comes a sentence striking by reason of its admissions and of its assumptions :

“He is, of course, aware that the income-tax figures do not exhibit the whole case, and especially that they do not take into account the important class of cases in which fresh outlay of landlords' capital without return has stood in place of reduction of rent. But his purpose was to compare Wales with England ; and *there is no reason to suppose that from this point of view the income-tax returns give less accurate results in the one case than in the other.*”

Here it is clear that the “authentic” argument is in the handwriting of Mr. Murray ; but the phraseology is Mr. Gladstone's own. First comes the admission, compelled by

candour, that the income-tax figures do not, even from the shallow arithmetical standpoint, exhibit the whole case; that, indeed, they do not exhibit that part of it concerning which, Welsh landowners and their agents (in spite of the efforts of the majority of the Commissioners to check them on the ground that they were covering ground already trodden whereas in fact they were giving evidence as to estates untouched by the Commission till then) gave an immense amount of valuable, albeit tedious, evidence. Then, in a sentence casting every species of doubt upon the whole body of the figures, and without presuming for a moment to say that they are accurate on either side, he proceeds to say that he has no reason to suppose one set to be less accurate than the other. As a matter of fact, of course, Mr. Gladstone knew perfectly well that neither set of figures was sufficiently accurate to warrant a comparison; also he knew perfectly well that the returns under Schedule A "Lands, &c.," must include sundry items other than agricultural rentals, the said items being of unknown, unascertainable and variable quantity.

A weaker argument, even if it had warranted the mere conclusion in arithmetic which was based upon it, was surely never addressed to the public in the hope that it would accept without comprehending it. Its foundation was eminently unsafe. But Mr. Gladstone's adversary, well knowing that in arguing before the casual public it is wise, where it is possible, to turn and rend your enemy in an arena of his own choice, took the pains to see how another view of Mr. Gladstone's own figures would suit Mr. Gladstone's position. In particular he had in his memory that quick answer of Mr. Chaplin's that to compare pastoral Wales with corn-growing England was unjust even to puerility. So, accepting Schedule A "Lands," as an index of rental for the moment (though he well knew it to be a faulty index) he compared the rise and fall of Schedule A "Lands" in four counties in England

similar in character, from the agricultural point of view, and nearly equal in value, with the rise and fall in Wales. The result was striking, for the figures stood thus :

INCOME TAX (SCHEDULE A).—LANDS.

ANNUAL VALUE OF LANDS ASSESSED.

	1876-77.	1889-90.
Cheshire. . .	£1,185,575	£1,144,457
Cornwall . .	930,032	902,556
Cumberland .	824,640	773,569
Westmoreland .	351,922	335,812
	£3,292,139	£3,156,394
Wales . . .	3,221,896	3,088,772

Thus the decrease in the case of the four English counties was shown to be £135,745, and in the case of the Welsh counties £133,124; and the difference, having regard to the greater value of the English counties at the outset, is not worth speaking of. It is not recorded that, upon having these figures brought to his notice, Mr. Gladstone condemned the landowners of these English counties of lack of sympathy and generosity to their tenants or pointed out to them the noble example of their fellow landowners in Essex whose rents, through no will of theirs, had fallen immensely more. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone's adversary was able to show that in the various survey districts dealing with the County of Essex from the Inland Revenue point of view, the rise and fall of returns was so irregular as to prove clearly the inadequacy of Inland Revenue returns as an index of rental. Nor can we do better than quote his figures and observations, to which, although they have been repeated frequently for three years at least, there is no answer yet forthcoming. Nor is any, except in the form of vulgar abuse, likely to be made. They stand thus :—

COUNTY OF ESSEX.

Survey.	1876-77.	1885-86.
Cambridge . . .	£109,345	£128,968
Chelmsford . . .	534,645	491,616
Colchester . . .	686,837	484,093
Hertford . . .	78,096	60,945
Stratford . . .	238,983	120,903
Tottenham (portion of) .	137,781	112,625
County of Essex . .	£1,785,687	£1,399,150

These are figures of a very striking character, showing that, while the annual value of the lands in the county fell by £386,537, the annual value of lands in that portion of the county of Essex which is included in the Cambridge survey district actually rose by all but £20,000. True, there may have been special local causes at Cambridge, but special local causes, which are numerous, go to make our point, which is that many varying factors go to make the aggregate figures, and that these figures do rise and fall for causes entirely distinct from the rise and fall of agricultural rentals.

The full argument upon this question will be found in the appendix, but it is necessary to point out at this stage that the arithmetical aspect of the matter, partly, perhaps, because it took a form calculated to attract the popular fancy, has received far more attention than it deserves from the scientific point of view. The real question is and was this: "Is there anything in the relation of landowner and tenant, or in the relations of a substantial number of landowners and tenants, in Wales so peculiar and exceptional as to call for and to justify the application to the tenure of land in Wales any legislative principles other than those which are used in England?" Such a question cannot be answered upon any such basis as that suggested by Mr. Ellis and adopted by Mr.

Gladstone later with considerable, and in some cases prudent, reservations. In discussing such an issue a thousand questions must necessarily crop up, and the principal ones among them are these: "Does systematic absenteeism prevail?" "Are the relations between landowner and tenant normally friendly?" "Are the conditions under which the farmer wins his livelihood better or worse in the one country than in the other, and, whether they be worse or better, is this result due to human and preventible causes or to physical and inevitable causes?" These and many other questions following from them are involved in the great problem which is in large measure our subject-matter.

CHAPTER III.

The Commission appointed—its Constitution—Antecedents of Members—Majority of Radicals over Unionists—the Terms of Reference and their Meaning—Issue affects English and Scotch Land also—Summary of Complaint against the Commission, its Methods and its Procedure.

MR. GLADSTONE'S Snowdon speech contained, as was recognised on all hands in North Wales, a virtual promise for the appointment of a Royal Commission; and the North Wales Property Defence Association immediately set themselves to work to prepare that careful and statistical evidence which they had every reason to expect that a Royal Commission would welcome with gratitude as essential to the discovery of truth. The landowners and supporters of the present system in South Wales, however, appeared inclined to let matters slide, and it was not until the announcement of the impending appointment of a Commission had been made and the names of the Commissioners had been published early in the Parliamentary Session of 1893 that they began to take steps towards organisation with the view of placing their case properly before the public. These facts were made known to the Commissioners at an early date; but, in the face of that knowledge, they elected to begin proceedings in Glamorganshire, where the landowners were confessedly unready, and where the very idea of the existence of a Land Question was young.

But the course of events must not be anticipated. The Commission, as announced to the public, was thus constituted:

Chairman, Lord (now Earl) Carrington; Lord Kenyon; Sir John T. Dillwyn Llewelyn; F. Seeböhm, Esq.; Professor (now Principal) Rhys; Edwin Grove, Esq.; D. Brynmor Jones, Esq., Q.C., M.P.; Mr. Richard Jones; Mr. J. Griffiths. Without entering into personal reference where it can be avoided, it is necessary to incur such odium as may be attached to inquiry into the antecedents of these gentlemen and into their qualifications for the grave and important task which lay before them. Lord Carrington was Lord Chamberlain; had been Governor of New South Wales; was, as he had every right to be, a pronounced Radical; was given to the discussion of social questions, from the sentimental point of view, with Cardinal Manning; had possessed a considerable estate in South Wales, which he had sold; and was a large landowner in England. Inasmuch as he had sold his Welsh estate immediately after he succeeded to it, he could not be regarded as having any special knowledge of Welsh affairs. Lord Kenyon, who was less than thirty years of age, and, it may be said without offence, quite unknown in public life, was a landowner on a considerable scale in Shropshire and in the Hundred of Maelor, which is technically Welsh, but for all practical purposes English. In politics he was a Conservative, and an opportunity may be taken here of saying that, throughout the sittings of the Commission, he displayed a practical knowledge of estate management which was invaluable, and a power of eliciting the truth by tactful and polite cross-examination which he may have inherited from his illustrious ancestor, who was Lord Chief Justice of England and Master of the Rolls at the end of the eighteenth century. His effectual work as a Commissioner may, perhaps, have surprised those who appointed him. Sir John Llewelyn was a large landowner in Glamorganshire, with a reputation for great administrative ability as Chairman of Quarter Sessions, and possessed of special knowledge upon a variety of subjects. In politics he was a Conservative, and

had sought Parliamentary honours without success: since the appointment of the Commission he has entered Parliament. Mr. F. Seeböhm was the member of the Commission who entered upon his duties with the highest public reputation. He was a Liberal Unionist in politics and a banker at Hitchin by profession; but his true fame was in the world of antiquarian letters. His *English Village Community*, published in 1883, is, and is likely to remain, the classical work on the subject; and during the existence of the Commission was published by Messrs. Longmans his masterly book on *The Tribal System in Wales*. That Mr. Seeböhm's interests were purely antiquarian it were erroneous to assert, for he showed throughout the inquiry an acute zeal to realise the conditions of rural life in Wales; but he would probably be the last man to claim practical acquaintance with the agricultural life of to-day in either England or Wales. The antecedents of Mr. Brynmor Jones, Q.C., M.P.—and to his antecedents we confine ourselves for the moment—may be told shortly. The son of a famous Nonconformist minister in South Wales, he had gone to the Bar, and after a shorter career on the South Wales circuit than commonly precedes official promotion, had been appointed a County Court Judge. Relinquishing this office he had returned to the Bar, and had entered Parliament as member for the Stroud Division of Gloucestershire. During the life of the Commission he has migrated to Glamorganshire, and now sits in Parliament as the Radical representative of a Welsh constituency. Of the politics of Professor (now Principal) Rhys little was or is known. He was, at the time of his appointment, Bursar of Jesus College, Oxford, which possesses considerable property in Wales, and his reputation as a Welsh antiquarian and folklorist stood then, as it stands now, very high. His scholarly knowledge of the Welsh language was, perhaps, his principal qualification, and certainly it stood the Commission in good stead. Mr. Edwin Grove, Chairman of the

Monmouthshire County Council, was an accountant and man of figures by occupation, a Radical in politics, and unacquainted with agricultural affairs. Mr. Richard Jones, a Montgomeryshire farmer, possessed little more than a parochial reputation when the Commission was appointed. He was known to have been educated at Aberystwith College, to be a fervent and active Radical in local politics, a strong Nonconformist, and a friend of Mr. T. E. Ellis. Mr. Griffiths was known as a sound farmer in Pembrokeshire, a judge of Castlemartin black cattle, a strong Nonconformist and Radical.

The natural criticisms to be offered upon the Commission as it stood were these. It contained five Radicals at the least, and perhaps six, to four or three Unionists as the case might be. It could not boast among its members one political economist of known repute. Its single representative of North Wales farmers came from the county of Montgomery, and was far better acquainted with the semi-English agriculture and population of the Severn Valley than with that of North Wales proper. The important counties of Anglesey, Carnarvon, Carmarthen, Cardigan, Brecon, Merioneth, Denbigh and Glamorgan were entirely unrepresented either by farmers or landowners. Finally, taking the Commission as it stood, it was noteworthy that one party in politics was represented by a lawyer skilled in the arts of cross-examination, and that the other side was not so represented.

The terms of reference directed the Commissioners "to inquire into the conditions upon which land is held, occupied, and cultivated in Wales and Monmouthshire;" and the intention of the Legislature in formulating them was reasonably plain, especially if regard was paid, as by reasonable men it certainly ought to have been, to the preceding circumstances. Requests for special legislation, analogous in character to the Irish Land Acts and to the Crofters' Acts, had been made by the Radical member for a division of Carnarvonshire, and

by the spokesman of the Welsh Radical party in the House of Commons. Certain agrarian grievances were alleged; Mr. Gladstone, then in Opposition, had answered that legislation must be preceded by inquiry; Mr. Gladstone, as Prime Minister, had appointed this Commission to make inquiry.

It was plain, therefore, that the Commission was established to inquire not into the social, religious, literary and commercial life of Wales generally, but into the existing conditions of agricultural life. It is clear also that the Commission was not, like the Commission appointed when Mr. John Morley was Irish Secretary, intended or desired to assume that certain legislative principles ought to be imported into Wales from Ireland and the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, but that it was desired primarily to give in its report such a true picture of the actual state of things in agricultural Wales as would enable Parliament to reach a just decision.

The issue was, and is, grave enough in all conscience, and sufficient both in comprehensiveness and importance to satisfy the curious ambition of any body of men. Nor was it one upon the settlement of which Englishmen and Scotchmen, whether landowners or tenants, could, or can, afford to look with indifference. As, ever since the Crofters' Acts came into operation, the party of agitation has constantly been working towards an extension of the area covered by them, so it were childish to suppose that, if a Land Act were passed to govern the relation of landowner and tenant in Wales, England could possibly escape. Whatsoever is done in Flint, Denbigh and Montgomery shires must, for good or evil, be done in Cheshire and Shropshire also. If the relation of landlord and tenant is to be regulated by strict law, to the exclusion of free contract—for this is the ultimate meaning of all Land Acts—in the counties of Radnor, Brecknock and Monmouth, the extension of the same system to Herefordshire, Worcestershire and Gloucestershire must be merely

a question, and at best a very short question, of time. For the moment we do not discuss from the economical point of view the very problematical merits of such legislation and its very obvious demerits.

WE CONTENT OURSELVES WITH WARNING LANDOWNERS AND TENANTS AND THE WHOLE BODY OF ENGLISHMEN IN WHOM A BELIEF IN HONEST PRINCIPLE AND IN FREEDOM OF CONTRACT STILL SURVIVES THAT THIS QUESTION, WELSH AS IT IS IN OUTWARD FORM, IS ENTIRELY AND ABSOLUTELY NATIONAL. WHEN THE TROUBLE FOR WALES COMES, AS IT SURELY WILL COME WHEN THE POLITICAL PENDULUM SWINGS AGAIN, WHEN MEN HAVE FORGOTTEN THE CONSTITUTION OF THIS COMMISSION, WHEN THE REPORT OF THE MAJORITY IS ACCEPTED WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE IMMENSELY VOLUMINOUS AND INTRICATE EVIDENCE (OF WHICH A LARGE PART IS QUITE IMMATERIAL FROM ANY SENSIBLE POINT OF VIEW), THEN IT IS AS SURE AS DEATH THAT THE FATE OF ALL THE LAND IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES WILL HANG IN THE BALANCE. WALES HAS BEEN PLACED IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE BATTLE; BUT HER FATE WILL BE THE FATE OF THE REST OF THE COUNTRY.

And how did this Commission address itself to this serious problem? Our complaints may be summarised in a preliminary fashion, thus :—

1. Well knowing, as everybody in Wales knew, that the public sittings of the Commission, besides being used as the occasion of giving valuable evidence as to the conditions of agricultural life in Wales, would be seized as an unrivalled opportunity for paying off political grudges and for raising purely or impurely personal questions, they pursued such rules of procedure and followed such practices in the reception of so-called evidence as to encourage rather than discourage the giving of evidence of this character and to deprive the persons accused of adequate opportunity of clearing their characters.

2. They so interpreted the terms of reference as to lead to

the impression that if the Government had said, "Go to Wales and find out all about it from the days of Llewelyn till now," they could not have accepted evidence covering a wider field or dealing with a greater variety of subjects.

3. A number of them, repeatedly and persistently, questioned witnesses, without prior regard to their intellectual capacity, in such a manner as to leave the impression that they were rather itinerant missionaries to preach the virtues of a Land Court, than Commissioners appointed to inquire into a grave problem on behalf of Her Majesty.

4. They did not treat witnesses, who came before them with evidence contrary to the prejudices of the majority of the Commissioners, with that fairness and politeness which such witnesses were entitled to expect.

These are all serious allegations requiring to be justified by chapter and verse, by statement of ascertained facts and by reference to particular passages in the evidence. They go to the very root of things and, if proved, they go a long way towards disposing of the report of the majority of the Commissioners. Assuredly therefore they deserve a chapter to themselves.

CHAPTER IV.

Procedure and Practice of the Commission—their Refusal to admit Counsel—Lord Penrhyn's Offer—Rules as to preliminary Copies of Evidence—"Members of the Public" permitted to exhibit Questions in Writing—Secretary to communicate with Persons aggrieved—Opportunities of Rebuttal to be given—Examples of Breach of these Rules—and of their ineffective Character when kept—Stringency of Procedure as to Rebuttal—the Allegation of Fear among the Tenantry—Mr. David Jones and Lord Penrhyn and the Conduct of the Secretary of the Commission—the strange Case of Parker at Newtown—the reckless Reception of irregular Evidence—prohibition of elementary Tests of Evidence—the Commissioners "revelled in Hearsay"—the Allegation of "fear" among Peasantry—its Manufacture—wild Interpretation of Terms of Reference—an Omnibus Commission.

IN the preceding chapter, and towards the end of it, the complaints which the supporters of the existing system of Land Tenure conceive themselves entitled at the end of the sittings of the Welsh Land Commission to bring against divers members of that body, were set forth in outline. The purpose of the present chapter is to set them out in detail and, in so setting them out, to justify them.

Let us speak, then, first upon the important matter of procedure. One of the earliest and best advised of the acts of the Commissioners after their appointment was to possess themselves, with the assistance of their secretary, of a large number of publications, books, pamphlets, extracts from newspapers and the like in which the Welsh Land Question and the agitation in respect of it were discussed from various points of view. To those members

of the Commission who had already followed the controversy upon the question in Wales, and to the secretary of the Commission, who was Welsh to the finger-tips, no study of this literature was necessary. They cannot have helped knowing that the tone of controversy was bitter and personal, beyond all precedent, while the strangers to Wales, with their long task lying before them, might have satisfied themselves by ten minutes reading, of "Adfyfr's" pamphlet or the answer to it, of Mr. Ellis's speech in the House of Commons, of the articles on the Welsh vernacular Press which had appeared in the *Times* and in the *National Review*, of the strongly worded series of articles which had but recently appeared in the *Western Mail*, that in all evidence in favour of change to be given before them a tone of philosophic tranquillity would be the last thing to expect.

Nor did they go unwarned of the things which were to come. Over and over again they were pressed by Lord Penrhyn and the North Wales Association to permit counsel to be heard on either side and to examine, or cross-examine, witnesses. Nay, more, so anxious was Lord Penrhyn in this matter, so convinced that injustice would be done if proper opportunities for sifting the evidence by cross-examination were not given that, in a formal application to the Commissioners, he went to the length of offering to meet out of his own pocket, if necessity arose, the expense of counsel to represent the party of agitation.

The Commissioners, however, with unanimity which was apparent rather than real, declined the offer and resolved not to permit oral cross-examination by counsel. The grounds for their attitude seem to have been these:

1. That the admission of counsel would have been virtually unprecedented. To which the answer is that it would not have been quite unprecedented: witness the case of the Mathew Commission in Ireland from which Mr. Carson

retired. Moreover, many unusual proceedings may be valuable.

2. That the fear of cross-examination might have deterred witnesses from coming forward. On this point it may be observed that the power of the Commission to check improper cross-examination would have been absolute and, as will be shown to demonstration later, that the tone of cross-examination adopted by members of the Commission on many occasions reached the limits of possibility in the way of harshness.

3. That the admission of counsel would have involved excessive expenditure of time. The answer to this is a frank denial. Counsel with a plain issue before them would not have dreamed of exhibiting questions on absolutely immaterial topics such as are mentioned later. Further, counsel acting upon instructions from their clients would certainly not have wasted a tenth of the time which was expended by Commissioners in that most fascinating but perilous of pastimes, cross-examination based on conjecture and not upon knowledge of the facts.

It is not, however, denied that the Royal Commission was absolutely within its legal rights in arriving at a decision not to sanction the appearance of counsel.

For the rest the Commission laid down the following rules of procedure:

(a) That each witness should give notice of his intention to give evidence fourteen days in advance and should send a summary, or a full statement of his evidence, seven days in advance.

(b) That any member of the public—and that after all is a privilege which cannot be denied even to counsel—might hand up to the Commission in writing any question or questions which he desired to see administered to a witness, and that such question, unless objected to by the Commission, should be put.

(c) That it should be the duty of the secretary, when any statement derogatory to the character of an absent man, or his conduct, was made, to communicate at once with the person accused.

(d) That full opportunities of rebutting such accusations should be given.

Let us see how these rules worked. If the first of them had been observed, the secretary would have been able to eliminate from statements of evidence that which was absolutely irrelevant. Also, wherever it was intended by a witness in his evidence in chief to impugn the character or conduct of another person, notice might, and in common fairness ought to, have been given to that person. But, as a matter of fact, this rule was broken with impunity over and over again; there is no sign, throughout the voluminous evidence, of any desire to eliminate irrelevancy; notice was but rarely given of an impending attack to the proposed victim, and, in one case, through inadvertence it is believed, landowners' representatives were all but persuaded to avoid a given sitting, at which highly controversial evidence was given, by the official statement that no controversial evidence was expected, and that, if any such came to hand, notice would be given.

A few instances, given from the writer's personal knowledge, will serve to exemplify the freedom with which the rule was broken. At Chepstow witnesses were few and far between, and, on the preceding evening, the list of witnesses was exceedingly short. Of the witnesses who appeared on the following day one was a person who hardly appeared to possess even average intelligence. His name was not on the list; he did not hand in, nor did he ever possess, a statement of evidence. In fact he simply talked at random for an hour or more to the profit of the official shorthand writer and none besides. It may be said that he was harmless; but the answer is that there was no ground for believing beforehand

that he would be harmless, and beyond this, rules are presumably made so that they may be kept; not merely for the purpose of being broken recklessly and without cause. Nor was the habitual breach of the rule without its serious consequences. The worst instance, perhaps, comes from South Wales in connection with a controversy between one Ben Maddy, a rabbit-catcher, and Mr. R. Thurston Bassett, Master of the Glamorganshire Foxhounds. In the original quarrel between them there are no features of interest or importance; but one day, at a sitting held at Carmarthen, a serious state of things came up. Notice, it should be said, had been sent to Mr. Bassett that it would be well for him to be present, but at so late a date that, being in London at the time, he had, as he telegraphed to the Commission, received the news in London on the day when it was imperative that he should be present at Carmarthen. Maddy, having handed in no statement in advance, proceeded to the table, and, in the most rapid and circumstantial way, poured out a statement, palpably founded on hearsay, which clearly involved an accusation against Mr. Bassett of misdemeanour in the shape of a flagrant breach of the Witnesses Protection Act of 1892. Almost the whole of the accusation was, on the face of it, founded upon hearsay; it was evidence at which a court of justice would not have looked for a moment. That Mr. Bassett should rebut that day was clearly impossible; that he might have something to say for himself was at least conceivable—and of the manner in which he was treated when he did come forward to give his evidence in rebuttal, there will be something for us to say later. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that, as soon as Maddy's evidence was over, evidence of which the worst parts were elicited by ingenious cross-examination in the form of leading questions from some of the Commissioners, the Chairman announced in open court that the Commission would consider his statement and, if it seemed to present a

prima facie case for prosecution, would submit it to the Director of Public Prosecutions. This course was taken while the accused man was unheard, and the South Wales papers, which are not more contemptuous of a sensation than any others, were naturally full of the subject. What is more, the case, with several others, was submitted to the Public Prosecutor who, in this case, as in the others, declined to proceed on the ground that there was no case.

The concession that a member of the public might exhibit questions in writing was something to be grateful for, and on the whole there was not much ground for complaint of the exercise by the Commissioners of their discretion to disallow such questions. But a moment's reflection will serve to show that this concession involved at best but a small mercy. Necessity compelled counsel to frame his series of questions while the witness was being examined in chief, and as such examination consisted, in the case of a monoglot Welsh witness, of the reading of his statement by the interpreter, time was precious. At Dolgelley, for example, the evidence of some five witnesses was passed on to the minutes in this manner within the space of ten minutes: indeed, it is credibly asserted that one man's evidence got on to the notes without ever having been given in open court at all. But even where there was plenty of time the process of cross-examination on paper was of extraordinary difficulty and apt to be quite ineffectual, and that for a plain reason. The preliminary questions in cross-examination must, in the ordinary course, go to make the foundation of those which are to follow. Evasive, untrue, or meaningless answers to these preliminary questions naturally and in very many cases rendered the whole superstructure of questions absolutely ineffectual. Meanwhile the Commissioners, being for the most part necessarily ignorant of the circumstances surrounding individuals and their allegations, would cross-examine at hazard with an effect sometimes of illustrating in amusing

ways the danger, which no lawyer would risk willingly, of cross-examination under such conditions. Thus, in Montgomeryshire, a man came forward to complain that his landlord had sued him in the County Court for the paltry sum of £3 10s. There was of course no real grievance seeing that the man owed the money. But the landlord was not named, and Mr. Commissioner Richard Jones, eager to hold up the tyrannous oppressor of the poor to public disdain, rushed in with an inquiry as to the landlord's name. "Indeed, sir, it was Mr. Humphreys Owen, M.P.," said the man, and the audience shouted in Homeric laughter, for Mr. Humphreys Owen was the local member and Mr. Commissioner Richard Jones was one of his most strenuous supporters. The trap, which was simple enough, had been laid deliberately; and Mr. Jones walked into it, as he walked into many others, with astonishing simplicity.

Rule (c) which had a specious appearance of consideration for the feelings of men, would have been more effectual if it had been carried out consistently; but even when this was done it was far from being satisfactory. It was the just subject of complaint early in the history of the Commission that the secretary, never a robust man and greatly overburdened with work at all times, did not send the prescribed notices as consistently as might have been desired. He was perhaps not much to be blamed. He was aware that landowners' representatives, both in North Wales and South, made a practice of communicating with their clients when they were attacked: but it is also true that he did not know who those clients were individually, and that evidence involving a list of members of either Association was refused to the Commission, more than once, by officials of both Associations. Again it must be remembered that the tone of allegations made against landowners was, in the general way, so virulent that an ordinary man, hearing these allegations day after day, might well be forgiven if any accusation against

a landowner, short of murder, highway robbery or arson, seemed to him unworthy of notice. Be that as it may many witnesses came forward to give rebutting evidence and showed plainly that the newspapers had conveyed to them the first intelligence that a false statement had been made against them.

But the rule, even when followed, was unsatisfactory. The accused person received a printed form stating that evidence affecting him had been given by A. B., and that a copy of the official shorthand note could be obtained on payment of the shorthand writer's charges of 8*d.* per folio of 72 words. Having ordered and paid for a great number of these shorthand notes the writer ventures to say that they cost the Associations of North and South Wales respectively at least £500 in the whole. This, of course, is independent of the orders given by private individuals and of payments made to shorthand writers employed privately. Now the statements involving accusations were, as a general rule, rambling and genealogical to start with, exuberantly verbose throughout, and protracted by questions in cross-examination on more than one occasion from every individual member of the Commission. It is submitted that to require a poor man, and many landowners are very poor, to meet this considerable expense as the preliminary to meeting an unknown charge made against him in his absence and without notice given to him, was in the last degree unjust. But it may be said the accused man might have waited for the official minutes of the evidence which were issued, in his own good time, by the Queen's printer. The answer is that the Queen's printer was very slow; thus, the writer was asked to revise in September 1895 the official proofs of evidence given by him in the spring of that year; and no self-respecting man, knowing he had been accused of some unnamed offence against honour or morality, could be expected to care to leave his character uncleared so long.

And when the opportunity of rebuttal came the process was far from the ideal standard of perfection. The chances were quite twenty to one that the original accusation was made upon the basis of hearsay evidence by a man who was a stranger to the original dispute, if any dispute there had been. Such a man, in nine cases out of ten, could not answer those questions in cross-examination which might have explained the whole matter. The typical case of rebuttal, was one in which the man who desired to repel an accusation made against him was called upon to give his evidence after a considerable period of time had elapsed since the original charge was formulated, and in a district far removed from that in which the country folk had heard his alleged offences against humanity described. So the audiences of mountain farmers and peasants, not given to reading the papers, who had listened to the case for the prosecution and had discussed it one with another, had no opportunity of listening to the case for the defence; and, as the Welsh vernacular papers for the most part omitted to publish any report of the long-delayed defence, the original audiences for the most part went under the impression that no denial or explanation had ever been given. This, however, was far from being the only drawback, for an obstinate neglect of the elementary rules of fairness, as the examples given will show, characterised the practice of the Commission in hearing rebutting evidence. Over and over again Lord Carrington, as Chairman of the Commission, attempted to confine rebutting evidence to sheer denial of the original charge, taken sentence by sentence, to the exclusion of all explanation. It needs hardly to be argued that such a rule was contrary to justice in its most obvious aspect; indeed, for the moment it is necessary to do no more than point out that, in nine cases out of ten, an explanation of the reason why this act or that was done is absolutely essential to the formation of judgment upon its quality and to a

decision whether the original act was harsh, merciful, or just. So plain is this fact, indeed, that the general public may well hesitate to accept a mere statement that any body of men, let alone a Royal Commission, ever endeavoured for a moment to enforce a rule so monstrous and so absolutely repugnant to every principle of justice. Prudence therefore dictates the citation of the *ipsissima verba* of the Chairman. Captain N. P. Stewart, the chief agent of the Vaynol estate (the reference is Question 13,625) was engaged in rebutting the evidence of sundry witnesses, when the Chairman addressed him thus:—

“Captain Stewart, you must clearly understand this, that rebutting evidence cannot be long statements saying what has been done and what has not been done, or going into the history of the people; we must have it that this is wrong or that is wrong, this is not true and so forth; we cannot have a discursive statement going back into ancient history.”

Again (Q. 20,333 onwards), Mr. R. Hughes Pritchard, of Bangor, was engaged in rebutting evidence given by Mr. David Owen, another solicitor of Bangor, to the effect that the tenant of a charity farm called Llyslllew, had been treated with great harshness by the trustees. The following dialogue took place:—

“*Lord Carrington.*—I understand that the Llyslllew case has been tried in a court of law?

“*Witness.*—It has, my lord.

“*Lord Carrington.*—We cannot go into the merits of the case; but is there anything in this statement that you wish to rebut?

“*Witness.*—Yes. A great deal.

“*Lord Carrington.*—Will you be kind enough to confine yourself not to the general case, but to pointing out anything

that you say is incorrect in the statement. We do not mean to go into the merits of the case. The case has been decided."

Now in this case the Chairman had to deal with a strong man who gave the Commission clearly to understand that he would state his case properly or not at all. His answer amounted to a severe condemnation, based upon justice so obvious that no impartial mind could doubt it, of the method which the Commission endeavoured to enforce. He said :—

"I submit that Mr. David Owen has gone into the merits of the case, and it would be perfectly impossible for me in replying to him to confine myself simply to rebutting certain small portions of what he has said. He has introduced a vast amount of prejudice into this case. Besides making mis-statements, he has made statements which are partially true and partially untrue, and I claim on behalf of the trustees the right of replying generally and of stating the case from their point of view."

Mr. Pritchard, in fact, refused to be browbeaten, and carried his point. But there were plenty of witnesses who, not possessing his experience in courts of law, were browbeaten and were prohibited from explaining and justifying acts which they could not deny *simpliciter*.

The injustice of such a rule of proceeding could no farther go. Take the common form of allegation, usually made by some other person than the alleged victim, that a tenant had been evicted for political or sectarian reasons. The non-appearance of the tenant was invariably explained on the ground that he was afraid to come forward, which was absurd, seeing that, if the man had been evicted, he had nothing left to fear from his landlord, even supposing he ever would have had anything to fear. Surely nothing could be more contrary to rudimentary justice than that, if the tenant had been

turned out at all, the landlord should be prohibited from explaining the causes which led to the change of tenancy; for in such cases a statement of surrounding circumstances may entirely alter the complexion of the original story, although each individual statement in that story, standing alone, may be true. *Suppressio veri* may, and for the most part does, amount to *suggestio falsi*.

But perhaps the most flagrant case of injustice in relation to rebutting evidence was that of Mr. Bassett which has already been mentioned. He had been accused by Maddy (Q. 42,209 *et seq.*) of using his influence to prevent Maddy from pursuing his employment because he, Maddy, had given evidence. The material sentence evidence, which is appended, was all hearsay.

“Q. 42,209.—Groom (the keeper) told me that Mr. Bassett had sent him to ask Mr. Watts (a farmer) not to employ me.

“Q. 42,210.—I was asked by Mr. Loughor (another farmer) to come to his farm to catch rabbits. Before I went I met Mr. Loughor, and he told me that he had received a letter from Mr. Bassett asking him not to employ Ben Maddy,” and so on.

Further statements were then made by Maddy against a Mr. Alexander, and the Chairman, there and then, without waiting to give Mr. Bassett an opportunity of answering a charge which, if true, would have involved him in a maximum penalty of £100 or a maximum imprisonment of three months, said: “The Commissioners, having heard your statements, will consider them carefully, and, if on consideration your allegations seem to present a *prima facie* case, will lay the matter before the Public Prosecutor.” In due time Mr. Bassett appeared to rebut at Brecon (50,724 onwards) bringing with him all the persons to whom Maddy had attributed language which they denied that they had used. Mr. Bassett positively

denied the alleged instruction to the keeper; he produced a letter of his own to Mr. Watts, the farmer, stating that he had no objection to his employing Maddy; he showed that he had simply asked Mr. Loughor not to employ any rabbit-catcher until after the coverts had been shot. Then a Mr. Radcliffe, who had presumed to employ another rabbit-catcher than Maddy, stated that his adoption of this course had nothing to do with Maddy's evidence. Then Mr. Loughor was called, denied that he had ever asked Maddy to catch rabbits, and, in brief, denied the whole of Maddy's story. The dissipation of this absurd story, which never ought to have been admitted as evidence, cost Mr. Bassett between £50 and £60.

At this point it is desirable to interpolate two very flagrant cases in which the first rule of practice laid down by the Commission seems to have either been disregarded or used for sinister purposes.

In the first of them to be dealt with Lord Penrhyn was concerned. It occurred in the spring of 1895 and care has been taken to place the facts irrevocably upon the minutes of the Commission. A sitting of the Commission in London was impending and *formal notice was sent to Mr. George Owen that no controversial evidence was expected and that if any such evidence was sent in notice would be given to him.* A similar notice was sent to Mr. Vincent who, however, deemed it prudent, or at the worst harmless, to attend, although no further notice had been received. He had his reward. The first witness called was Mr. David Jones, a solicitor of Llanrwst, who made against Lord Penrhyn, in relation to his purchase of part of Lord Ancaster's Gwydyr estate, a series of accusations into the details of which it is needless to enter. Suffice it to say that Lord Carrington, from the Chair, described them as being very serious charges, and that Lord Penrhyn and his advisers deemed it necessary to bring up to London later a body of witnesses who, it is not too much to say, refuted the original allegations com-

pletely and absolutely, and proved that Mr. Jones made an entirely false charge. The same witness (Mr. Jones) then made a series of allegations, concerning the management of a Denbighshire estate, of so violently controversial a character, that the Commission, having had their attention called to the wording of the secretary's notice, and after retiring for consultation, ordered them to be expunged from the minutes. That this error on the part of the secretary was due to inadvertence and not to any sinister motive I am assured; but one who was compelled to practice before the Commission, and in whom inadvertence would not have been pardoned, may be excused for saying that the case is illustrative of the difficulties with which he had to contend. Either the rule of forwarding evidence beforehand was broken, which is not likely since the *evidence in question* (apart from any matter affecting Lord Penrhyn) *was brought forward at the express request of the Commission*; or the secretary made a statement as to the contents of a document which he had not read; or he guessed the probable contents of a document which had not arrived at the office of the Commission. In any event he broke his promise upon an important subject, and, from the public point of view, such an act, even though due to inadvertence, is a very serious and grave matter. The work of a secretary to a Commission is tedious no doubt; but he undertakes it of his own free will and, from a man in such an official position as his, the public has a right to expect and insist upon having scrupulous exactitude.

The second case is one with regard to which, after the fullest consideration possible, it is impossible to offer any satisfactory explanation or to acquit persons unknown of a nefarious agreement to defame the character of a man who was not only absent but in bad health. In these circumstances the wise course is for the writer, who was an eye-witness of and a listener at the scene, to state the bald facts and to leave the task of explanation to supernatural charity.

The scene was the Commission's Court at Newtown. Several persons, of whom the writer was one, asked at the opening of the Court for the usual list of the names of witnesses for the day. The name Parker did not appear in that list. Early in the forenoon, however, a man, who turned out to be Parker, entered the room precisely as his name was being called, and took his seat at the table. This person then proceeded to give evidence of the gravest conceivable character against Sir Pryce Jones. The effect of the story was that Parker, being agent for an estate practically in Newtown, which was the property of an eccentric owner residing at Reading, had been bribed repeatedly, periodically and on a magnificent scale by Sir Pryce Jones. The object of this bribery—Parker himself did not shrink from the word when it was put to him bluntly—was stated to be that, in consideration of moneys received, Parker might induce his principal to grant to Sir Pryce Jones a long lease of his Newtown property; and the alleged object of this proceeding was that Sir Pryce Jones might be placed in a position to exercise irresistible political pressure over the numerous tenants.

Such was the statement: it belongs to that class of statement which is not worth a particle of notice without distinct and emphatic corroboration; it was simply the confession, or purported to be the confession, of a thorough-paced scoundrel, who introduced himself to the Commission as a man who, having sold his master's interests, was prepared to betray the man who bribed him. No notice was taken by Sir Pryce Jones of his calumniator; the Commission to all appearance treated his statements with just scorn.

But why, seeing that at best his evidence related only to an urban neighbourhood, and might be taken as the fetid scum remaining from the whirlpool of passion caused by a hard-fought election petition, was he brought forward? Why did not his name appear on the list of witnesses?

How came it that his name was called out suddenly at the moment when he entered the door? Finally, why was no notice of this terrible accusation sent to the man whose character would have suffered if Parker had been believed? Fortunately it is no part of our duty to answer any of these questions or to dissipate from the whole scene those clouds of suspicion in which it is wrapped. But that they ought to be answered by some person or persons is abundantly clear; for, on the face of it, the story is distinctly discreditable to the Commission.

Let us leave this odious subject and proceed to state the principles which were followed in relation to the acceptance and rejection of evidence. It cannot be denied, of course, that a Royal Commission is entitled in this matter to be a law unto itself, even a new law every day. It may accept anything, even a statement in a newspaper paragraph, as evidence one day and reject a deed the next day. Nor is it pretended that a Royal Commission is bound by the ordinary laws of evidence. On the other hand it is within the rights of any man to urge that when an investigating body persistently declines to apply to evidence the most elementary tests, the conclusions based upon evidence so collected are at least as open to doubt as the evidence itself. There is no sanctity about the law of evidence. It has neither a divine nor, for the most part, even a statutory origin. It merely represents the conditions with which statements must comply, according to the accumulated experience of generations, before they can be accepted as true. It prefers the best attainable evidence to the worst, direct evidence to hearsay, original documents to copies made by hand; and, since in this book at any rate we are under no obligation to place men on the same plane with angels, there need be no hesitation in saying that the foundation of the law of evidence is the knowledge that all men are liable to error, and that a large number of men are prone to deliberate falsehood.

Let us see then how the Welsh Land Commissioners treated the law of evidence in the general way, although it must be admitted at the same time that they relapsed into strictness on occasion. To begin with, and at a very early stage of the proceedings, they not only discarded but prohibited the most elementary and necessary test of the truth of testimony; that is to say, they absolutely forbade any questions to be addressed either by a Commissioner or "member of the public" to any witness concerning the manner in which his evidence had been prepared. This extraordinary rule was passed under the following circumstances in South Wales during the first week of the active life of the Commission. A witness, not unfavourable to the existing law of tenure, had given his evidence. He was, with great propriety, cross-examined as to the manner in which his evidence had been prepared. Counsel, representing landowners as "a member of the public," never dreamed of objecting to the cross-examination. Why should he have protested against the application of an obvious touchstone? But he took the precaution of causing the questions put from the bench to be taken down in shorthand, and, when the next witness on the other side came forward with a flowery and consecutive statement—the said witness being a man of humble circumstances and apparently indifferent culture—these identical questions were administered to him by a "member of the public." Sundry Commissioners, not recognising the original authorship of these questions, protested. It seemed to them an outrage that a witness whom they liked should be harried in so unfeeling a manner. A note was then handed in, pointing out that these questions had emanated from the Bench, and were not a sinister invention of the enemy; moreover, it was pointed out, in forensic language, that sauce for the goose is sauce also for the gander. Thereupon, after the adjournment, it was found that a rule had been passed denying sauce to either bird. In fact, all questions as to the sources or preparation of evidence were

absolutely forbidden. Now, seeing that it is impossible to conceive a more persuasive inducement to the wholesale fabrication of evidence, it becomes necessary to explain how the evidence on our side was collected. Evidence does not collect itself; that is certain. Somebody must see to its preparation or it will never be ready. The whole of the evidence on our side in North and South Wales was collected thus. The syllabus of the Commission, containing a large number of questions, was printed verbatim, but in an extended form, so as to leave space for a witness to write his answer. A very small number of additional questions was asked. They were questions which were obviously relevant. In no single case were the answers, which were in the handwriting of the witness, altered. Copies were taken for use before the Commission and no more. It is, however, a curious circumstance that, on more than one occasion, individual Commissioners failed to recognise that the main body of the questions emanated from the Commission itself, and objected to the great area which they covered. Landowners, however, were justified in acting on the belief that the Commission, having asked a number of questions, desired to have them answered: and they did answer them in the manner described and no other. To farmers the North Wales Association issued a simpler and shorter form of questions, and as to the answers the same practice was pursued. This can be proved by documentary evidence now, if desired, and any lawyer will admit that a more innocent method of preparing evidence could not be devised. At the same time, it must be observed that there is a coherence and splendour of style about much of the evidence given to the contrary effect by men in the position of very simple peasants which gives ground for suspicion.

Next, the Commission simply revelled in hearsay. This was excusable in some measure in the case of such witnesses as the Rev. Ifan Davies, a young Congregational minister, who [Q. 6800 onwards] made allegations as to alleged usurp-

ation of pieces of common in 1838 by Sir Watkin Williams Wynn and made statements as to seven alleged cases of political eviction in 1859. True it is that the value of his evidence as to the common question was but small; still it directed the attention of the Wynnstey authorities to the estate books, which were conclusive in the matter. True is it also that 1859 is not so very long ago but that some survivors of that date might be found to give better evidence, and it may be added that the statement of Mr. Thomas Ellis, who was at the time Junior Lord of the Treasury, on this topic did not possess the same power to convince which would have belonged to a statement, concerning the same subject-matter, if it had been made by his father. But in relation to hearsay evidence of this character there is no reason for raising such grave objections as those which must be raised against other classes of hearsay evidence.

Of these classes of hearsay evidence there were two principal kinds. The first of these was the evidence of witnesses who appeared in the capacity of self-appointed delegates, so to speak, not merely to give expression to the general opinion of farmers in a particular district, but also to state the individual grievances of men who simply would not take the trouble to come forward. A typical witness of this kind was Mr. Thomas Davies, who gave evidence at Bala (7972 *et seq.*). That the Commission had no objection to this kind of evidence and, in fact invited it, is clear from the Chairman's opening words:

"State as shortly and concisely as you can the principal points you wish to emphasise, and state your own case, and then give the cases of the other tenants for whom you are privileged to speak."

Inasmuch as we are concerned for the moment only with the principles, which we venture to call loose, upon which

evidence was admitted, the blue-book pages may be passed over until the vicarious part of the evidence is reached (8139). In that there are several cases to which observations are annexed showing the uselessness of the vicarious system.

(a) Witness spoke of a farm named Penlan, said it had been let eight years ago to one Roberts on an understanding that repairs would be effected. Roberts left after five years, the house only having been repaired. Simon succeeded. Picturesque details followed as to state of barn roof.

Observations.—What sort of understanding? Oral or written? Between Roberts and whom? What could Roberts fear from giving evidence if he had relinquished the tenancy?

(b) Witness, in relation to two farms near Bala to the rents of which additions had been made in consequence of additions made to the area of the farms, added that the tenant of both farms had difficulty in paying their rents, that the tenant of one paid no wages to his two sons and one daughter, and had saved no money.

Observations.—Questions of some importance would clearly have been asked of the tenants themselves; but there was no use in questioning the delegate—perhaps a volunteer—on matters beyond his knowledge.

(c) Witness alleged a verbal understanding between tenant and landlord, that landlord was to supply 1000 drain pipes per annum as long as required, and a breach of such understanding after 1500 pipes had been supplied.

Observations.—Landlord might dispute the understanding, question manner of applying pipes, &c., *ad libitum*. Tenant might have been questioned on this point; delegate knew nothing about it.

(d) Witness described farm of Ysgubor gerig consisting of two parcels of 15 acres a mile apart, complained that there were no buildings on upper part and that tenant, aged 60, and wife, had to work farm themselves owing to inability to

pay for labour. Complained also that rent had risen from £24 to £28 and then £35.

Observations.—Likely enough. It is idle to expect separate buildings for an exceptional farm divided like this one. The holding is clearly a peasant holding, the tenant of which could not be expected to be able to hire labour. The statements as to increase of rent are valueless without dates even if correct.

Upon these valuable statements, two of which were minimised on the spot by some pertinent questions from Mr. Lloyd Price, the only landowner referred to in them who was present, the Chairman publicly directed the secretary to communicate with all the landlords concerned. Thus upon a statement made by a stranger to the contract of tenancy, by a man who was not in a position to give a complete account of the state of things, several gentlemen were asked either to put themselves to inconvenience to attend before the Commission or to be content to lie under some sort of stigma.

It may be added that this kind of evidence, of which the above is merely a sample taken at haphazard, was all the more valueless inasmuch as in many cases it has been discovered to have been worse even than hearsay, as having been given without the knowledge or consent or even against the wishes of the tenants alleged to be aggrieved. But the most objectionable kind of hearsay of all was that which was admitted frequently—and in the face of vigorous, repeated but hopeless protest—upon serious questions involving men's personal conduct and character. Of this it were impossible to conceive a more flagrant example than the statement of Maddy (*vide supra*) in which Mr. Thurston Bassett was accused of a crime which, if it had been brought home to him, would have rendered him liable to three months' hard labour, a fine of £100 and to find Maddy a livelihood for the term of his natural life.

The excuse made for all this was the constant if indefinite assertion of witnesses that the best evidence was not attainable because the men who ought to come forward were afraid. The history of the growth of this assertion is of some interest. Long before the Commission was dreamed of, the vernacular journals had denounced the Welsh people, particularly those amongst them who would not ally themselves to journalistic schemes of agitation originating in a desire for newspaper profits, in superlative terms of contempt. No sooner was the Commission appointed than the same newspapers, with tedious and unending iteration, adjured the tenantry to be of good courage, to come forward and be eloquent upon their grievances. But the adjuration was always accompanied by a significant warning that, the Witnesses Protection Act 1892 notwithstanding, the givers of straightforward testimony might suffer terrible things. The fact of the matter is that the party of agitation, who had been working in vain for years to promote discontent and had persisted in inventing grievances in the abstract, were nonplussed when a friendly and deluded Administration took them at their word and appointed a Commission which, friendly as it was, could not be expected to report without some concrete evidence upon which to base its conclusions.

And they knew, of that there is not the smallest doubt, that such evidence would be more than commonly hard to find. The mass of their invective had been directed against the more considerable owners of property, and it was upon them that they had lavished every abusive epithet and every flowery expression that could be conceived. A sample of this habitual language will be found in the extracts quoted in Lord Penrhyn's evidence (*supra*).

But when the necessity for adducing substantial proof and of giving up scandalous rhetoric came to them, when they became conscious of the fact that a Royal Commission could not reasonably be expected to accept as evidence comparisons

between great landowners and unclean beasts or birds of prey, or vague and general scurrilities concerning landowners as a body, they were placed in a position of some awkwardness. And this became the more plain to them when they reflected that the large estates were, one and all, managed in a spirit of such generosity and toleration as no Act of the Legislature could hope to enforce or would be likely to attempt to impose. Among the smaller properties, albeit some of them also were and are managed in a large-hearted and open-handed fashion, they might, perhaps, have found some appearance of grievance. At any rate they could have shown that the tenants of the larger estates were, taken as a body, in a better position than the tenants upon smaller estates. Nor is the reason far to seek. It is to be found in the simple fact that the owners of small estates, unless they had incomes arising from other sources than land, simply could not afford to give away so large a proportion of their incomes in abatements and reductions, or to make such great expenditure in repairs and improvements, as their more wealthy brethren. Moreover, the agitators had to face the fact that the great mass of the farming population, which had been alleged to be in a state of seething discontent, was in fact quite tranquil, satisfied that the landowners had done what they could to meet the depression in agricultural prices, well aware that to that end great sacrifices had been made by landowners. Lastly, if they had attacked the small landowners, they well knew that in so doing they would run no inconsiderable risk of offending men of their own political and religious creeds.

Of direct evidence, therefore, they saw that little could be obtained. They perceived, and the sequel showed their judgment to be correct, that necessity would compel them to rely largely upon the evidence of persons unfamiliar with the incidents of agricultural life, who were strangers to the meaning of a contract of tenancy, and unacquainted with the

facts embodied in the relation of landlord and tenant. A passing glance at the volumes of evidence shows that among the most voluble and positive of witnesses were Nonconformist ministers of various denominations, solicitors fighting o'er again battles which they had lost in the Law Courts (the evidence of Mr. David Owen, solicitor, at Llangefni is typical), tradesmen in towns and villages, journalists, printers, professional agitators, and the like. Now this was not a pleasing prospect. There was reasonable cause to fear that the Commissioners might suggest that, as one would not ask an artist to advise one concerning investments, or a chemist to act as a lawyer, so ministers, tradesmen, solicitors, and the like were not the best judges of the value of land or the justice of conditions of tenancy. Hence came the necessity for imagining beforehand an excuse which might serve to induce the Commissioners to accept evidence which, in the great majority of cases, it would be fulsome flattery to describe by the epithet second-rate.

That this allegation was absolutely devoid of foundation in fact is, to speak plainly, perfectly well known in Wales. Many witnesses, some of them spontaneously, others by way of answer to leading or suggestive questions exhibited by the Commissioners, averred that a general feeling of fear existed, or as one witness, with no high opinion of the courage of humanity, said, "That there was a kind of instinct of fear in a man." None, until very late in the day (when the alleged cases of intimidation in South Wales were brought forward to be ridiculed by the Public Prosecutor), ventured to mention any specific cases, real or imaginary; many, indeed, admitted that there was no cause or reason for any such fear. Other witnesses, landowners, agents and farmers, persistently ridiculed the whole idea. But it was impossible not to perceive that the allegation, unflattering to the verge of insult as it seemed to be so far as the Welsh people were concerned, made a strong impression on many of the Commissioners.

Questions leading to it were asked time after time; the Chairman, on opening the proceedings of the Commission in a new county or district, made a practice of reading the operative sentences of the Witnesses Protection Act, 1892, aloud in a solemn voice, and of announcing, in a tone of severe resolution, the determination of the Commission to set the law in motion whensoever occasion arose. Nay more, individual Commissioners, many of them, went so far as to ask numerous landowners and their agents whether they had issued to the tenantry public invitations to tender evidence before the Commission. To have taken any such course would, it is submitted, have been an act on the part of the landowning classes equally impolitic and arrogant. It would have been an admission by them that the tenantry were in a state of fear; it would have been a false suggestion, because they were perfectly well aware that the tenantry were not frightened at all and had no cause for fear; and, surely, it would have been presumptuous and insulting to the last degree for one class of men to grant graciously and condescendingly to another class of men permission to do that which they had an absolute right to do of their own free will.

Be it here asserted formally and solemnly that this feeling of fear certainly did not exist, did not prevent witnesses from appearing before the Commission, that the assertion of it was simply an invention of the party of agitation and a cloak to cover the absence of evidence. None the less, unless divers of the Commissioners asked many questions for sheer love of mischievous amusement, it is certain that this alleged fear will take a prominent place in the report of the majority of the Commissioners. But suppose for the moment that we are wrong, and that men and women were deterred from describing their grievances. None the less the admission of hearsay evidence was, in a great number of cases, wholly inexcusable and not to be explained at all by the allegation of an imaginary terror. Thus in the numerous cases where

it was alleged that men or women still living had suffered hardship in a tenancy which had expired, where a landowner was accused of having resorted to what Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P., called, in his House of Commons speech, the *ultima ratio* of eviction, it was clearly idle to say that the alleged victim was in fear of coming forward. If the story were true nothing was left for him to dread. The landowner had done his worst. In too many of these cases there is reason to suspect that the witness was such a person as Lord Stanley of Alderley had in his mind when (Q. 19,883) he said, by way of reply to a question handed in by one of the audience to the Commission, "This is not a tenant coming forward to complain. It is some meddling outsider. What does he know about it?"

Still less could the alleged existence of fear, which is such a very easy thing to assert and so difficult a thing to disprove, be used to explain the frequent admission of hand-made copies of documents, of undated agreements (and the date is very material having regard to the allegation of contracts out of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883), of verbal statements concerning the effect of written documents. Be it observed that no person alleges that the Commission had not power to do all these things. But the persons who are conscious in advance that, without due regard to the evidence given in favour of the existing system, they will be condemned as certainly as they would have been if no evidence had ever been taken, venture to say earnestly, emphatically, and confidently that a very great part of the evidence on which the condemnation will be based is, on the face of it, absolutely worthless. It is simply not in accordance with the rules established by human experience for the elementary testing of evidence. And they add that if, as Mr. Commissioner Griffiths complained at Carnarvon, farmers did not attend the meetings in any great numbers, that fact was due not to any ignoble and irrational fear, but to lack

of interest in the proceedings of the Commission which, albeit conducted occasionally with a spirited eye to the gallery, were far from being exhilarating.

For the length at which this question of evidence has been treated, no apology is offered; the importance of it is vital; it goes to the root of the question whether the recommendations of the majority of the Commission are worthy of serious consideration or not. It is one thing to call a man a robber and prove the charge to the satisfaction of reason; it is quite another thing to base the accusation on a statement, which may be untrue in itself, that somebody else has said something to that effect which may, wilfully or ignorantly, be misrepresented in the repetition. It is to any conclusions based on this kind of evidence that the most strenuous objection is raised.

The second point of objection raised against the Welsh Land Commission at the end of the preceding chapter was that it gave an immensely wide definition to the terms of reference, and thus wasted a great deal of public time and money. It must be said at once that this is a public grievance rather than one of which Welshmen have an individual right to complain. If the Commission chose to hear the opinions of Mr. Pritchard Morgan, M.P., on gold-mining royalties, opinions which had nothing of novelty in them, or to listen while a Druidical newspaper reporter discoursed on the precarious state of the Rockingstone, or to encourage the reading of long essays purporting to embody the history of mediæval or pre-mediæval Wales, no great harm was done. Only, we take leave to say, those subjects are omitted in this volume as being of no practical importance. Again, if the Commission was pleased to question Lord Penrhyn's chief land agent as to his title to certain lands, and to re-open the question between the Duke of Beaufort and the Swansea Corporation as to the foreshore at Swansea, it mattered very little. For Lord Penrhyn's agent

firmly declined to make reply upon a matter which was as foreign to his duties as it was outside the scope of the Commission, and the Duke of Beaufort's advisers were not to be drawn into arguing before a mixed Commission, containing but one professional lawyer, a question which had been settled once and for all by those very competent judges who formed the Court of Exchequer fifty years ago. Nor, perhaps, did it matter much that the Commissioners should by question invite witnesses to describe and define the methods of religious instruction used at elementary schools, or the statistics of illegitimacy in various districts. These things were wanton waste of public money; that is all; and they are mentioned here partly as illustrative of the intellectual capacity and power of adhering to the main issues which characterised the body appointed to inquire into a great problem, and partly to reassure the general student of the evidence. He may learn with pleasure that a good third of the thousands of pages is absolutely irrelevant; but enough remains to remind us of Macaulay's criticism of Dr. Nares's Burleigh of which, we shrewdly suspect, the report itself will remind us also:

"The title is as long as an ordinary preface; the prefatory matter would furnish out an ordinary book, and the book contains as much reading as an ordinary library. We cannot sum up the merits of the stupendous mass of paper which lies before us better than by saying that it consists of about 2000 closely printed quarto pages, that it occupies 1500 inches cubic measure, and that it weighs 60 lbs. avoirdupois."

CHAPTER V.

Majority of the Commission started with Prejudice in Favour of a Land Court—Assertion justified by Selection of Questions—Treatment of Witnesses opposed to a Land Court—severe Cross-examination—Mr. Brynmor Jones, Q.C., M.P., and Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West—Lord Carrington and Captain Stewart—the “Coffin letter” rejected by Lord Carrington—the Sequel in the Merionethshire Outrage—Lord Carrington and the Clergyman—Mr. Brynmor Jones insults some Montgomeryshire Farmers—the Commission fails to secure Evidence from Substantial and Representative Farmers.

AT the end of the third chapter the four main complaints raised against the majority of the Welsh Land Commission were summarised. Two of these have been dealt with in detail in Chapter IV.; two remain for treatment.

The Commission was appointed, as the history of its appointment clearly shows, to inquire into facts rather than into opinions. Those who placed it in office apparently desired that, as the result of investigation, a report should be laid before Parliament, and that this report should contain a picture of “the conditions under which land is held, occupied and cultivated in Wales and Monmouthshire,” that is to say, of plain facts. From this picture, if it were painted well and faithfully, Parliament might, it was hoped, be able to form an opinion upon the question whether it was necessary to apply to this part of the United Kingdom legislation founded upon the principles, similar in point of principle to (or, to speak more accurately, in resolute disregard of economic principle), and differing in detail only from the Welsh Land Bills of

Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P., and Mr. J. Bryn Roberts, M.P., the recent Irish Land Acts, and the Crofters' Acts. Our third complaint against the majority of the members of the Welsh Land Commission is that they played undisguisedly the part of missionaries of the gospel of a Land Court; that they collected a number of expressions of opinion which were valueless, since they were given on the spur of the moment by persons who had given no thought to the subject, and by persons who, were they never so honest, had not the equipment of education and intelligence which would give weight to their judgment on a problem so complex; that where witnesses expressed themselves favourable to a Land Court they were led on by gentle and suggestive questions until they were in the realm of matters to which they had never given a moment's thought; that where witnesses expressed the contrary opinion they were cross-examined with a severity which stood in marked contrast to the tone adopted towards those who, from the point of view of the majority of the Commissioners, prophesied smooth things.

By way of preliminary it must be observed that for the purposes of this chapter a Land Court must be understood to be any form of tribunal endowed by the Legislature with the right of pronouncing, as between landowner and tenant, compulsory judgment upon the question of rent, since all other questions, whether of greater or less fixity of tenure, or of compensation for improvements, or like matters, stand quite apart from this question. Much curiosity was shown as to the precise meaning of the phrase "Land Court" at various times. On this point it may be observed that the phrase may never mean anything in Wales, and that if it ever possesses a meaning it will be defined by the Legislature. But it is quite clear that from the questions of various Commissioners that when they spoke of a Land Court they had in view, and the witnesses also had in view, some body which should possess the power to remove the question of rent from

the domain of contract, and to fix the rent of this or that holding by external authority.

Of the merits or demerits of such an institution it is not necessary to speak at this point. Our complaint, after exhaustive analysis of the evidence and of the questions put by various Commissioners, is that a majority of the Commissioners made it plain from the beginning that they were of opinion that such an institution would be for the benefit of the agricultural community.

To recapitulate the whole, or even a substantial fraction, of the suggestive and argumentative questions which soon produced this impression on the minds of persons who followed the proceedings of the Commission would be a process for which a long volume of close print would be necessary; and at the best a selection of extracts in cold print could hardly give an idea of the vast difference of tone between questions addressed to witnesses favourable to a Land Court and those who ventured to express the contrary opinion. We must rather ask the reader to have recourse to the evidence itself in order to form his own judgment as to the general tone of questions. Still it is desirable to give, even in the course of this brief text, a few instances to justify the statement that a majority of the Commissioners started upon their investigation with a preconceived idea that a Land Court was to be recommended. The Commissioners included in this assertion are the Chairman (Lord Carrington), Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Grove, Mr. Richard Jones, and Mr. Griffiths. Principal Rhys appeared for the most part to be hovering between two opinions; that is to say, he asked a great number of questions which seemed to tend towards the establishment of a Land Court, but at Llangefni he protested that his ideas on the Land Court question were "hazy," as frankly as, at another sitting, he confessed his inability to understand the laws of political economy. For the advocates of a Land Court, whether they were competent to speak on

the subject or not, things were made very easy. They had but to whisper the words "Land Court" to induce members of the Commission virtually to give evidence and express opinions for them. The witness assented and no more. The opinions, a Commissioner's opinions really, and not emanating from the brain of a witness, were duly recorded in the minutes. Here is a case in point in which the witness was under examination by Lord Carrington. Inasmuch as it came very early in the proceedings it may well be quoted, for, although it was a South Wales case, the Chairman carried with him into South Wales the same brain and the same ideas which were with him in the North. The witness, Captain Batcock, was a retired master mariner who had taken to farming; in opinions he was what some persons call an ardent Reformer, or what others call a rampant Radical. It will be observed that four words from the witness and about a hundred and eighty words from Lord Carrington go to make the evidence which was put into this witness's mouth rather than extracted from him. Here is the conversation, which is particularly noteworthy for the fact that his lordship did not suggest to the witness any of the disadvantages of a Land Court from a tenant's point of view, but simply asked him to assent to a rose-coloured dream.

"3764. . . . You told us you wished for a Land Court. Now is it for this reason? Would you like to see a Land Court established that you could refer to, if you thought your rent was higher than it ought to be, and the landlord thought it was a fair rent? Is that what you mean?"

"*Witness*.—Yes.

"3765. A sort of Court that you could refer to of practical men who would decide, and whose decision would be final and legal, as to what rent you were to pay?"

"*Witness*.—Yes.

"3766. As for fixity of tenure, I suppose you mean that so long as you paid that rent and farmed in a husbandlike manner, you should be secured in your holding, and able to live on that holding so long as you carried on the conditions imposed you by that Court. Is that the sort of thing?

"*Witness* :—Yes.

"3767. And besides that you would wish the Court to adjudicate on any losses from game or losses from timber-felling that you might be subjected to and that the landlord might decline to pay. You would refer those sort of questions to the Land Court as well?

"*Witness* :—Yes, my lord.

Of all the advocates of the Establishment of a Land Court. Mr. Commissioner Richard Jones was the most frank and, may we add, the most indiscreet. Here are some samples of questions addressed by him to witnesses in North Wales from whom he expected pleasant answers.

"Then you consider that a tenant is at the mercy of his landlord?"

"Then because of that you ask for some important Tribunal to decide the question of rent as between landlord and tenant?"

"Therefore in this case you are not able to contract with your landlord on equal terms?"

The questions which follow, addressed to Mr. T. E. Ellis, illustrate a delusion, common to Mr. Richard Jones and Mr. Grove, that the objection to a Land Court would disappear from men's minds if, before appealing to the Court, landlord and tenant were able to agree. For our part we are unable to conceive any Court of which the jurisdiction would not be ousted by prior agreement between the proposed suitors and the questions appear to be of a somewhat puerile character. However, let the questions speak for themselves.

"16,978. In respect of a Land Court, Mr. Ellis, would you suggest that a Land Court should come in between the landlord and tenant in the first instance, or should it be simply a Court of appeal for either party to go to in case of failure to come to agreement?"

"16,979. I suppose you would suggest that the Court should not only decide questions of rent but questions of repairs? The question has been repeatedly put by the representatives of the landlords to witnesses, 'In case a Land Court was established, do you think the landlords would ever spend anything on repairs?'"

"16,980. Again, under a Land Court would there be or should there be a statutory condition with respect to cropping—that there should be more freedom of cropping?"

Such are samples of the persuasive manner in which witnesses favourable to the principle of a Land Court were treated. They might easily be multiplied a hundred-fold from the lips of Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Griffiths, and Mr. Grove.

In marked contrast hear the tone adopted towards witnesses who presumed to take the contrary views. Here are a few examples. Mr. D. Williams, an Anglesey farmer spoke thus:

"20,807. Should I be asked questions respecting a Land Court, whether I am for it, my reply is in the negative, as I am firmly of opinion that it would create a wide gulf between landlord and tenant. If there should be a Court at all, its function should be to put a stop to this unreasonable grabbing for land. The majority of the landlords in my opinion will always be ready to meet their tenants; they are not the class of people land-agitators wish to make them appear in the sight of the country. The tenants of every estate should be loyal to each other, and unite together to put their grievances before their landlord. The result of this in my

opinion will be far better for the welfare of the tenants than a Land Court."

Upon this the wrath of Mr. Commissioner Richard Jones was kindled so fiercely that he promptly proceeded to break the rule of the Commission prohibiting inquiry as to the sources of evidence, of which rule it may be said that, strange as it was, it ought to have been applied to all witnesses if it was applied to any. Here are his questions and the answers.

"20,808. Are you giving evidence on your own account, or do you represent other people?—On my own account. I would not come on any other account, only myself.

"20,809. You have not been asked by any one?—I am on my own account; of course I am in co. with the tenants.

"20,810. But you are not representing them in any sense. You have not been sent by the tenants?—The tenants wish me to speak on the agreement.

"20,811. Did you have a meeting of the tenants, and were you sent as a deputation, so to speak, to appear before the Commission?—I was with the tenants.

"20,812. You had a meeting?—Yes, we had a meeting together.

"20,813. And you were appointed?—I was appointed.

"20,814. To give evidence?—Yes.

"20,815. I do not know whether it is too much to ask you who composed your evidence?—You do not think I have been able to do it myself, I suppose. We were together.

"20,816. Who were together?—I do not see that I can answer that—as tenants."

Again, when Lord Penrhyn was giving evidence, Mr. Commissioner Griffiths argued in an interrogatory form in favour of a Land Court and made statements as to the effect of the evidence on which comment is made in parentheses.

"23,002. The evidence we have had before us from the labourers and farmers was that the present rents could not be maintained." (This was incorrect, for there was evidence both ways.)

"23,003. Then would it not be fair for the tenants and labourers as well as the landlords to have some Court to settle those questions, some Court of Appeal?"

"23,004. Some Tribunal of Appeal, or Land Court or anything else?"

"23,005. They all urge that there should be some tribunal to appeal to." (This again was utterly incorrect. The labourers had nothing to say in the matter, and among the farmers who came forward, albeit it was but natural that those who were discontented should come forward in the larger numbers, there was great difference of opinion on the matter.)

But the farmers who opposed the views of the majority of the Commission met often such treatment as was not likely to encourage others to follow in their footsteps, and in describing their fate it is inevitable that we should cross the line which divides the allegation that the majority of the Commissioners started with a prejudice in favour of a Land Court, from the allegation that they also showed prejudice against landowners and all witnesses favourable to the existing law. The two topics should, therefore, be dealt with coincidentally.

Mr. W. Humphreys of Aberkin, a tenant farmer (Q. 10,486 *et seq.*), was such a witness. He alleged that some of the tenantry were afraid of giving such evidence as might displease the preachers and, *inter alia*, that the establishment of a Land Court would destroy all good feeling between landowners and tenants. Let us see how he was treated. First Mr. Brynmor Jones (10,562) suggested, thereby breaking one of the few rules of practice known to the Commission, that Mr. Humphreys had been in collusion with Mr. George Owen,

the late secretary of what Mr. Jones was pleased to describe as the "so-called Property Defence Association." That insinuation having been disposed of, Mr. Brynmor Jones observed, "it seemed to me that most of your evidence consisted of conclusions and opinions." Then (10,602) Mr. Brynmor Jones proceeded to draw a vivid picture of the powers of a landlord by comparison with those of a dissenting minister; although he knows, none better, how strong is the influence of these persons. Then Mr. Brynmor Jones harried him on the Land Court question. Next Mr. Richard Jones reminded him that he "depended on the liberality of the landlord," asked him what the effect of this was on him and other farmers, "so far as their independence was concerned," suggested that he felt the necessity of "conforming to the whims of his landlord and not provoking his anger for fear of getting turned out," and observed, "I must say I cannot understand your process of reasoning." After him Mr. Griffiths proceeded to preach the gospel of a Land Court thus:

"10,713. Take the case of a tenant and a landlord failing to agree about the rent. They may be on the very best of terms (I have a case in my mind just now), on the same side of politics and everything else, but the landlord thinks the farm is let reasonably, and the tenant thinks the farm is let at too high a rent. How would you suggest to settle that question?—I think the tenant ought to take care, when he is taking the farm, not to promise too much rent for it.

"10,714. Then the tenant must go and leave the farm, if he thinks the landlord is asking too much for it?—I think if he makes a bad bargain he ought to be responsible for it, as he is for anything else."

Now at that time the reputation of Mr. Humphreys of Aberkin, as a farmer, stood high, though in facing Mr.

Brynmor Jones and Mr. Richard Jones, both of them strong Radicals, he stood at a disadvantage. He was a Conservative, and a forthcoming candidate for Parliament; but it is at least conceivable that a Parliamentary candidate should give truthful evidence and, as a voluntary witness before a Royal Commission, even a Conservative is entitled to be spared the insult of offensive cross-examination.

This word "offensive" may be deemed strong, but it may be written without hesitation that the term represents precisely the feeling of the Welsh landowners generally towards Mr. Brynmor Jones. Nor can he say "*Oderint dum metuant*," for in truth they have no cause to fear him. His method of cross-examination has indeed been described by the *Baner*, Mr. Gee's famous anti-landlord and anti-church paper, as "cutting laces out of the skins of landlords;" but from the practical point of view it was a complete failure. He irritated men beyond endurance, but he got nothing out of them; at Llanrwst, indeed, his cross-examination of Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West was so intolerable that it became necessary to send up to the Commission an intimation that, unless Mr. Jones curbed himself, no further evidence would be offered by landowners or their agents. But to attempt to obtain information by exasperating questions is always, and in this case the rule had no exception, inartistic and ineffectual, and to speak plainly Mr. Brynmor Jones did not extort from indignant witnesses an amount of information nearly proportionate to the hearty dislike towards him which he roused in the minds of many hundreds of persons.

For a thoroughly instructive illustration of the method applied by the majority of the Commission to a witness of whom they did not approve, we may refer the reader to the case of Captain Niel Patrick Stewart, Mr. Assheton Smith's agent. The case is so full of information as to the difficulties with which landowners had to deal in facing the Commission

as to be worth quotation at length. Captain Stewart was engaged in rebutting the evidence of one Thomas Williams, of Parcia Rhos. The original allegations of Thomas Williams may be gathered from the dialogue, which shows in a very striking way not only the harshness with which Captain Stewart was treated while he met an accusation of some seriousness, but also, apart from the mere allegation of personal grievance, the extremely loose fashion in which the original witness was allowed to give evidence, which turned out to be inaccurate, upon matters of which he was not in the least likely to have any knowledge.

“Chairman.

“13,550. Now we will take the rebutting evidence* you wish to give. What portion of Thomas Williams’s evidence do you wish to rebut?—Every figure he has given is entirely wrong, and entirely misleading.

“13,551. Where shall we begin?—At the beginning. He told you for one thing that he did not know why he was sent out of his farm. As he declined to tell you, I had better do so. He was sent away because he was a most inveterate poacher. He poached over and over again, and Mr. Assheton Smith forgave him over and over again, and the third time he forgave him Thomas Williams gave a most solemn declaration he would not poach again. However, he did poach again, and it was then we turned him out.

“13,552. The poaching case was after sunset, when he was taken up for catching a rabbit on the railway line?—That was not this case at all. I do not think the case he was convicted for was on the railway line.

“13,553. That is what he told us. That he took a rabbit on the railway line, and two keepers jumped over the wall and

* As a matter of fact the real rebutting evidence, which is given later, came from the mouth of Mr. I. B. Allanson, solicitor.

collared him?—I forget the details; but I have the date of the conviction here.

“13,554. He took a rabbit on the limits of his own farm, he said, and two keepers jumped over the wall and took him into custody?—I cannot say anything with regard to the details of the case, but he was convicted.

“*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*

“13,555. But why did the keepers take him into custody?—The case came before the magistrates at the time, and he was convicted.

“*Chairman.*

“13,556. You do not rebut that?—Do you mean about being on the railway?

“13,557. You do not rebut that he on his own farm, on the railroad, took a rabbit out of the trap, and that two keepers came over the wall, and took him into custody for that?—The man was convicted before the magistrates, and I cannot say more than that.

“13,558. We want to know what the case is. Do you rebut that part of his evidence?—I should like to get a copy of the evidence before the magistrates' clerk. I can give the date of the conviction.

“*Mr. Brynmor Jones.*

“13,559. Just notice the point and see if his statement is untrue. What he said was that he simply took the rabbit from the trap within the limits of his own farm. The point we are making is this, that the action of the gamekeepers in seizing his person seems rather violent?—I hardly see how you can pass an opinion on the case without hearing the evidence.

“13,560. What evidence?—The evidence given by the keepers.

"13,561. The question is, do you contradict the evidence given by him to us?—I say the trap was first of all Mr. Assheton Smith's trap, and therefore he first of all stole the trap to catch the rabbit.

"13,562. Was he seized?—Yes.

"13,563. For what?—Poaching. Surely they had a right to do that. It was not the first, second, or third time; he was found to be constantly poaching.

"Chairman.

"13,564. Is it or is it not the fact? You seem to know that he was taken up by Mr. Assheton Smith's keepers for taking a rabbit out of a trap?—It depends upon where the trap was.

"13,565. I do not want you to answer if you do not know. You told me it was Mr. Assheton Smith's trap, therefore you seem to know something about it. Was he, or not, taken up by Mr. Assheton Smith's keepers for taking a rabbit out of a trap on his own farm?—He was taken up for poaching, and convicted for it.

"13,566. You do not wish to say anything about Mr. Assheton Smith's trap?—No, I do not.

"13,567. You simply say he was taken up for poaching?—Yes, for repeated acts of poaching. When the November term was out, and the time had expired, he refused to turn out. There was a good deal of disagreeableness then, and he pleaded very hard to be forgiven, and even then he was forgiven. He was forgiven, I ought to say, on his signing a letter of apology which was written out by me, and has been put in evidence. He pleaded very hard to be allowed to go on for another year, because the price of cattle was very low at the time.

"13,568. What does your evidence rebut?—I will rebut a lot of his figures now with regard to Parcia Rhos, that is his

own farm. He says the rent was £36. That is wrong, the rent was £45 12s.

"13,569. Was the farm ever in his occupation at £36?—It might have been £36 one hundred years ago. I do not know. This is a property we purchased in 1867.

"13,570. When was the rent raised to £44 15s.?—It must have been before Mr. Assheton Smith purchased the estate.

"13,571. When was that?—In 1867. Thomas Williams stated that the rent was £36 at first.

"13,572. But afterwards the rent was raised to £44 15s., and it was £45 in what year?—When Mr. Assheton Smith purchased the property in 1867 the rent was £45 12s.

"13,573. He says £44 15s.; there is not much difference about it. Then he goes on to deal with Vaynol; when the estate was valued the rent was raised to £49 10s., he says; do you rebut that?—No.

"13,574. He says, 'Owing to the labour and perseverance of my parents and the children who were obliged to work for their food and clothing until they reached the time for turning out in the world or getting married. I was bred and born on the spot (and lived there) until the end of the year 1887.' You do not rebut that?—We allowed him to go on.

"13,575. 'I was turned out without a halfpenny of compensation.' Do you rebut that?—Yes.

"13,576. How much was he compensated?—He was compensated for game damages several times.

"13,577. Was he compensated when he was turned out?—Not for improvements.

"13,578. You do not rebut that?—No, I say he was not entitled to improvements.

"13,579. He does not say he was. He says he was turned out without a halfpenny of compensation for any of the improvements made on the place?—I should like just to say that he was not entitled to any compensation.

“ Mr. Brynmor Jones.

“13,580. He sent in his claim?—Yes.

“ Chairman.

“13,581. He says he was turned out without a halfpenny for all the improvements he had made on the place. You gave him no compensation?—No, because he was not entitled to any.

“13,582. He sent in an account for walls and drains?—Yes, he did send it in.

“13,583. And he has not had anything to this day—that is right?—Yes.

“13,584. He says, ‘ And in all probability I shall never get it ’?—No, I do not think he is likely to get it.

“13,585. ‘ As the agent has declined to answer my last two letters ’—do you deny that?—Yes.

“13,586. You did reply?—Yes, I believe he never wrote me a letter which I did not answer.

“13,587. ‘ Also I was packed out of the estate office when I was there on business, and I can name or indicate the person who turned me out, and he told me very kindly that the landlord would not see me at all, though he was at the office at the time. I was obliged to sell my stock when the price of stock was low, and I think that I lost about £150 by that means ’?—I do not know what he lost.

“13,588. ‘ Compared with what I should have if I had been allowed to remain a year or two longer there ’?—I know he expressed his gratitude for being allowed to remain an additional year, and this is a letter he sent to Mr. Assheton Smith on the subject, dated 20th December 1886. He was turned out in 1887:

'PARCIA RHOS, LLANDDEINIOLLEN,

' December 20th, 1886.

' DEAR SIR,

' I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant.

' I beg to state that I am greatly obliged to Mr. Assheton Smith for his kindness and good wishes in this matter, and to let me stay on for another year.

' I remain,

' Yours respectfully,

' THOS. WILLIAMS.'

" 13,589. You let him stay on to that time?—Yes. I ought to state further that his sisters had the offer of remaining in the farm after their brother had gone.

" 13,590. Will you just remind us of that when we come to that. Then: 'I have often been acting as beater in the shooting. I never received a penny of pay for that.' I do not think we need go into that?—Tenants are never employed as beaters, but sometimes for the love of sport they go out in the company of Mr. Assheton Smith, but they are never employed.

" *Professor Rhys.*

" 13,591. Would not a poacher be able to beat?—He might if he was honest enough.

" *Chairman.*

" 13,592. Do you deny that he ever did beat?—Oh, no; he may have been out beating.

" 13,593. Then there is nothing to deny. 'I was turned out of the place at the end of the year 1887.' Do you deny that?—He was turned out certainly.

" 13,594. And 'they declined to give me a reason, though I asked the agent.'

"13,595. You give the reason now?—I give the reason now.

"13,596. But did you tell him that he was a poacher at the time?—Yes, frequently. It was not one or two acts at all.

"13,597. Then you gave him as a reason why you turned him out that he was a poacher?—Yes.

"13,598. You say that?—Yes.

"13,599. 'The only thing he told me was that the landlord wanted the place. A new tenant went into the farm.' Is there anything else?—He goes into figures with regard to some other farms; take the Fachwen Farm.

"13,600. 'It consisted of one farm many years ago at a rent of £60.' Is that right?—No; it is quite wrong.

"13,601. What is it?—Instead of being £60, the rent when we purchased the property was £188.

"13,602. He says many years ago?—If he means a thousand years ago, of course I cannot say.

"13,603. No, he says 'which consisted of one farm many years ago at a rent of £60.' Have you any reason to doubt that?—I think so, because in 1840 the rent was £188. It must have been a great many centuries ago, of which Thomas Williams could know nothing, that the rent was £60.

"13,604. I suppose that is all hearsay. 'The place has been divided into small holdings for the quarrymen to build, and they have small holdings on lease of 30 years.' Is that right?—No, they have no lease, my lord.

"13,605. Small holdings on no lease you say. 'It is said that they pay from 5s. up to £3, according to the size of the holding?'—No, I do not know any so low as 5s.

"13,606. A few shillings up to £3. Is that about right?—Up to £5, some of them are.

"13,607. 'But by this time it is supposed that the place pays about £400.' Is that right?—No, that is wrong. The rent now received is £362 3s. 6d.

"13,608. Well, you say it is £362 3s. 6d.?—When a man goes into figures, I like him to be accurate, my lord.

"13,609. Of course he had not got the book?—But I would like to explain this, that Mr. Assheton Smith, after he purchased the property, expended money on it; he expended £1573 5s. 8d., whereas Mr. Williams said the tenants did all. He paid for the property £13,500.

"13,610. Never mind that. All I want is the rebutting evidence. I do not want to go into that. He says that the place pays about £400 and you say it paid about £362?—£362, and the rent at the time we bought it, instead of being £60, was £188.

"13,611. 'I know of other places where the rent has been doubled within the last three years.' Is there anything else to rebut?—I think there were some other farms.

"13,612. I hope I am not making any mistake, but I want you to have an opportunity of rebutting anything he says, not as to statements of Mr. Assheton Smith himself, we had that in your evidence-in-chief. He says, 'A great part of the estate of Vaynol is devastated by game.' Is that true?—No, it is very untrue.

"13,613. Then 'farmers must have fixity of tenure.' I suppose you would rebut that? Also they should have arbitration or Land Court, compensation for improvements, and the abolition of the Game Laws?—Our agreements provide compensation. It is amply provided for.

"13,614. I do not think there is very much more in his evidence. May I ask you, is there anything else you want to rebut? There are some questions put in; the first is by Mr. Williams: 'When did Mr. Assheton Smith become proprietor of Parcia Rhos—before 1860?'—In 1867 he became proprietor.

"13,615. Mr. Vincent asks: 'When Parcia Rhos became vacant, were threatening letters written?'—There were.

"13,616. What were they about—threatening letters who

to?—They were threatening the incoming tenant, my lord. This is one of them. I should like it read [*handing letter in*]. That is a copy of it.

“13,617. Do you really wish this read?—I think so, my lord.

“13,618. ‘*William Owen, do not covet thy neighbour’s house. It is a fearful state of things that such as this must be sent to a leader in the church of God. What a face you have, you devil!! to advise others.*’ *Who was this written to? It is an anonymous letter with a coffin at the end. I really should not like to read it?**—It was written to the incoming tenant, my lord.

“13,619. We will take it that the incoming tenant got an anonymous letter calling him a devil; the letter was not signed, and there was a coffin at the base of it?—He was intimidated, my lord, to such an extent that he declined to go to the farm, and I think that fact ought to be known. He was intimidated to such an extent that he was afraid to take the farm, and he never did go there.

“13,620. He was intimidated to such an extent by this letter that he declined to take the farm. Mr. Vincent wants to know, ‘Will you give the date of the conviction’—I take it that is the rabbit controversy?—On the 26th of March, 1887.

“13,621. Then Mr. J. R. Hughes asks: ‘Were leases granted on small holdings previous to Captain Stewart’s time, and have any of these leases fallen in during his term?’—No.

“13,622. They were not granted before you came?—No, my lord. I am not aware of any leases being granted.

“13,623. There were no leases which have fallen in?—No. Some leases in towns have fallen in.

* It was, no doubt, very wise in Lord Carrington’s estimation to make nothing of this threatening letter; but it happens that, in 1896, a similar threatening letter was followed in Merionethshire by an act of arson involving the loss of a homestead and a number of animals.

"13,624. But not in the estate?—No, my lord." *

Again the Rev. J. W. Wynne Jones appeared at Rhyl to rebut a charge and produced a copy instead of an original document. He expressed himself willing to swear that it was a true copy, whereupon the Chairman exclaimed, "We are not empowered to take evidence on oath, even from a clergyman." The tone in which the words were spoken raised a titter of laughter from the vulgar part of the audience. But Lord Carrington, on hearing the retort, "There is such a thing as talking to the gallery on these occasions," probably felt that he had met his match.

But it was in the wilds of Montgomeryshire that the most scandalous scene in the annals of the Commission and the proceeding which excited the most profound indignation took place. Nine substantial farmers on Sir Watkin Wynn's and the Dowager Lady Wynn's estates gave evidence together at Llanfyllin. They agreed in stating that their relations with the landowners were pleasant and in objecting to a Land Court, and in contentment with their position. Even in examination-in-chief they did not escape leading questions from the Chairman, such as, "Do you hear any general conversation that the rents in this neighbourhood are too high or not?" which particular question drew the answer, "Some would complain if they had the whole of it for nothing." But all

* The real rebutting evidence to the charge of Thos. Williams was given by Mr. Allanson at Rhyl, Q. 65,378 *et seq.* It amounts to this. Williams and his sisters were joint tenants of the farm. Williams was a persistent poacher; had repeatedly promised to amend, and repeatedly offended. Notice to quit was served Nov. 1885. In Nov. 1886 Williams did not quit. By arrangement with his agent he was allowed to remain, on signing the letter of apology already quoted, for a year as a tenant at will, &c. Mr. Allanson then produced a certificate of conviction under the Ground Game Act, dated 26 March, 1887—*i.e.*, long after all the promises, and called attention to the fact that the trap was Mr. Assheton Smith's property. He stated also that the man was not seized by the keepers, and that there was no railway anywhere near. It is amusing to observe that, whereas the man's story before the Commission was that he had been arrested by the keepers trap in hand, Mr. Allanson was able to inform the Commissioners that his defence at the trial was, *save the mark*, an *alibi*.

landowners had by that time forced themselves into accepting with philosophy the Commission's practice of pumping out of reluctant witnesses evidence and ideas which originated in the brain of the interrogating Commissioner. But what followed was unprecedented. These men, of good repute and credit in their district, stood surrounded by a great crowd of their fellow farmers. To them Mr. Brynmor Jones exhibited the following questions and the italics of the official minutes give a very clear idea of the dramatic character of the scene.

"67,632*a*. I did not quite gather what the answer was to a somewhat searching question put to you by Mr. Griffiths, which of course none of you could answer fully; but are we to take it that none of you have had to borrow money of recent years to pay the rent? I do not take it individually, but are we to take it from you all that none of you have had to borrow money to pay the rent within the last few years?—(*Mr. Edward Jones.*) I admit that I have.

"67,633. Now let me put to you another question. I will not put it to any one of you individually, but I will put it collectively to you, gentlemen. Can any one of you say that you saved £50 on your farming in the year 1893 or 1894? If any one can, let him hold his hand up. (*No response.*) Not one of you lifts up his hand. Now I will put the same question, substituting £25 for £50. (*No response.*)?—(*Mr. Edward Jones.*) It is a very difficult question."

Mr. Edward Jones probably intended to convey the fact which all must recognise, that he with others was unwilling to make public the precise circumstances in which he stood.

One of the audience supplemented Mr. Edward Jones by calling out in a clear voice, "It is a very unfair question." The interrupter was turned out of the room, of course, and the Chairman, forgetting previous events such as the cross-examination of Captain Stewart and of Colonel Sackville

West, expatiated upon the desire of the Commission to show all possible courtesy to all persons. But the mass of gentlemen in the Court-room were certainly of one opinion with the interrupter, who did but express the general view that this was an improper, unfeeling, and inquisitorial question ; nor, we take it, will the public judgment be inclined to support Mr. Brynmor Jones.

It needs hardly to be said that questions of this character, questions which would be perfectly justifiable if addressed to a witness who came forward in a police-court to prove an *alibi* in the case of a notorious evildoer, produced the effect, which probably was not intended, of deterring a very large number of witnesses from coming forward. For this statement the reader must be asked to accept the word of those who had the conduct of the case from the landowners' point of view ; it can only be added that it is a solemn statement of absolute fact. Nor is this a light matter. The Commission's report might be of some value if it were founded in the main upon the evidence of practical men familiar with the conditions of agricultural life in Wales. It is not so founded, partly by reason of the indifference with which it was regarded by a large section of the farmers and partly by reason of the reluctance of men to submit themselves voluntarily to vulgar and impertinent cross-examination by a professional lawyer subject to no superior authority.

CHAPTER VI.

Report of the Majority of the Commission predicted—will recommend something equivalent to a Land Court—North Wales Landowners state their Position—Definition of Essentials of a Land Court—the Irish Land Courts—Report of the Committee on the Irish Act of 1881—the Duke of Argyll's Exposure of the Act—Mr. Gladstone's "Original Righteousness" and subsequent Collapse—Theories of "Fair Rent" examined—Effects of Judicial Rent must be destruction of Friendly Feeling, to turn Landowner into mere Rent-charger, to check Improvement by Mutual Agreement, the Establishment of Saleable Tenantright, the Giving of part of Owner's Property to the sitting Tenant—the Evils of Free Sale—Irish examples—condemned by Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P., and Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P.—Further Effects of a Land Court are Reduction in Selling Price of Land—Impossibility of State Advances to Peasant Proprietors who are encumbered—Compensation alone necessary.

THE foregoing chapters have established the proposition, never doubted for a moment by those who followed the Commission in its movements through the Principality, that the majority of the Royal Commissioners started upon their wanderings with a preconceived idea that it would be their duty to recommend the establishment of some institution in the nature of a Land Court. In this statement no imputation upon the Commissioners is involved. Men differ from one another in the point of view from which they approach the consideration of important questions. One class of mind is apt to believe that every change is for the better, and that, because a revolution in the relations of landowner and tenant has been introduced in Ireland and in parts of Scotland, it is in accordance with the natural fitness of things that the like

revolution should be introduced into the same relations in other parts of the country. Another class of intelligence, which we venture to call the more rational and scientific of the two, prefers to judge past legislation by its results, so far as they may be visible and capable of ascertainment, and does not hesitate to apply to such legislation criticism based upon the lessons of political experience and upon the principles of common honesty.

The vital portion of the report of the majority of the Commission will, it is morally certain, be to the following effect: "We find in Wales and Monmouthshire that the appetite known as land-hunger exists, that is to say, that, when a farm is vacant, men will enter into excessive and infatuated competition for the tenancy and will offer rents far in excess of what is reasonable. We think, therefore, that it is for the public benefit that some machinery should be established which should prevent rents from being pushed by competition to so high a figure that it would be simply impossible for tenant-farmers to make a living." They will say, also, albeit probably in language far more diffuse and circuitous than is used here, that in the inception of the contract of tenancy the two contracting parties do not stand upon an equal footing, since the landowner has the monopoly of an article, that is to say land, of which the supply is limited, and that in these circumstances it is essential to institute some authority which shall have power, at the request of either party to the contract, to vary its terms and fix what is known, for reasons that are unknown, as a "fair rent."

This suggestion, we are well assured, will be made by at least five of the gentlemen who have been appointed to inquire into the alleged Welsh Land Question. It is a very grave proposal, involving the belief that the uniform tendency of civilisation towards individual ownership of land and towards freedom of contract (a tendency which stated

thus broadly cannot be denied with regard to the history of this country up to 1870 at any rate) is absolutely and fundamentally wrong.

What then is the attitude of landowners as a body—for the exceptions to the rule are barely worthy of consideration and hardly enough, if we may permit ourselves to use an ancient paradox, to prove it—towards this suggestion whether it be regarded as made generally or, in view of the evidence and statements described as evidence laid before the Welsh Land Commission, as made in relation to Wales and Monmouthshire only?

What they say in answer to the second question is what they have said repeatedly in their evidence, what the many thousands of Blue-book pages embodying the minutes of the proceedings of the Welsh Land Commission go to prove, and what the main part of this volume goes to justify. They say, in fact, that even if it were assumed that the existence of a large number of cases of hardship and oppression would justify the establishment of what, for the moment, we will call a Land Court, an exhaustive inquiry by a body before which landowners had considerable difficulties to meet, has not only failed to prove the existence of such an exceptional state of things as might justify the proposed innovation, but has also resulted in proof to demonstration that such a state of things does not exist. They claim to have proved that the tenantry of Wales are at least as comfortably situated, so far as their relations with their landlords go, as the tenantry of England or of Scotland, and that, so far as it is possible to arrive at a conclusion, the standard of valuation for purposes of rental, due regard being taken for surrounding circumstances in each case, is not a whit higher in Wales than it is in England. They claim confidently to have proved themselves, as a body, to be neither worse nor better than their English brethren, and to have established the proposition that although, by the accident of politics and by the ingenuity of politicians, they have

been placed in the forefront of the battle, no case has been made out for the application of exceptional legislation to Wales and Monmouthshire.

Their first attitude, however, is for the moment the more important; and it is essential that its precise lines should be borne in mind constantly when, in the remainder of this volume, we come to deal with general and specific allegations of grievance. Their case, in short, is this:

"We deny the existence of the grievances which are alleged; we say the evidence, upon which the allegations are based, is flimsy and unsubstantial beyond belief, and that of the allegations made an immense number have been absolutely disproved. Further, we deny that if the alleged grievances had been demonstrated to exist, the establishment of a Land Court would be in any way effectual to remove them. We say also that such a tribunal is essentially contrary to economic principle, and that its immediate effects would be prejudicial to the interests of all classes connected with land from landowner to labourer. Lastly, we say that if the grievances did exist, they could be allayed or removed by methods infinitely less ruinous than those which the Welsh Land Commission proposes."

That, speaking succinctly, is their case upon the general, as distinguished from the concrete, question; but it is, of course, not sufficient to state it in this bald form, and it is essential to define our idea of a Land Court (although the Commissioners never did so with any precision before questioning witnesses) and then state the main objections to it. After study of the institutions of that nature already in existence in Ireland and in Scotland, and after farther study of the questions, which must be presumed to have been intelligent, exhibited by Her Majesty's Commissioners, we define the expression Land Court as follows: "A Land Court is an institution consisting of one or more men, of which the

essence is that it has authority, at the request of either landowner or tenant, to fix for a given period the annual rent to be paid for any given farm or agricultural or pastoral holding, which rent shall be called the 'fair rent.' It need hardly be said that many statements were made by witnesses, and many questions were put by Commissioners, which pointed to far wider ideas than this as to the scope and jurisdiction of a Land Court. It was suggested, for example, that such a Court might try questions of compensation for improvements between outgoing tenant and landlord; but, inasmuch as these questions are already tried in the County Court by the application of existing laws to the facts proved in each case, it is manifest that to entrust this power to a Land Court would simply amount to assigning a new name to a familiar process of law. It was suggested that a Land Court might confer upon the tenantry fixity of tenure, thus enabling the tenant to get rid of his landlord at will, but prohibiting the landlord from getting rid of his tenant except for certain specified reasons. But this suggestion was thoughtless, for, in any event, fixity of tenure could be nothing but a statutory right. If such a right were conferred by statute, then, objectionable as the term Land Court must be by virtue of its associations in recent history, it would not really matter what name was given to the Court which administered the obnoxious law. Our objection, in that case, would be primarily to the statute, and, so long as the tribunal interpreted the statute fairly, we should have no right to criticise those who administered the statute. For example, the High Court of Justice administers the Bills of Sale Act with results which are, to say the least of it, curious; but nobody blames the High Court; everybody agrees with Lord Esher's pungent saying in the Court of Appeal: "If Parliament enacts nonsense, judges have no choice but to administer nonsense."

It may be said at first sight, "Surely the objection to a

Land Court to fix 'fair rents' is gone, because it, also, being established by Statute, would exist for the purpose of administering and interpreting certain definite principles." But this would be but an ignorant and short-sighted argument. Look at the Irish Acts. In them, indeed, it is laid down that certain considerations, such as the amounts expended by landowner and tenant respectively on improvements and buildings, shall be taken into account in fixing the rent and that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, certain improvements shall (nobody knows why) be assumed to be tenant's improvements. But these directions are merely incidental and the question what is, or is not, the "fair rent" of this or that holding is left to be decided eventually by the individual opinions of the Land Commissioners. No substantial principles are laid down for their guidance, still less is a definite direction of law placed before them for their interpretation; for the simple reason that to lay down such principles or to formulate such definite directions, passes the wit of man.

This is no expression of opinion emanating from the brain of a writer who does not desire for a moment to conceal the fact that he is stating a case from one point of view, albeit in the full consciousness that to overstate it would be a fatal error of judgment. On the contrary it is but a paraphrase of the report of a Committee of the House of Commons (and that by no means a Committee favourable to landowners), appointed to inquire into the operations of the Irish Land Act of 1881. They reported in these words:

"The Act of 1881 laid down no principle or rule, or method of valuation to guide the Court in fixing the amount of rent no subsequent Statute has touched the subject of the principles of a fair rent—no mode of valuation has been prescribed by Parliament or otherwise—consequently, of necessity, each individual administrator acts

absolutely according to his own opinion of what may have been intended, and there is neither a common understanding of the law, nor anything approaching to uniformity in practice." (Report, pp. 5-6.)

"Coming from such a body, this is indeed the witnessing of a good confession," said the Duke of Argyll in the first, published in the *Times* of November 29th, 1894, of a series of masterly articles. And in this article His Grace adduced what may be called an historical argument of great value, precisely applicable to the suggestion made in the case of Wales, an argument which can hardly be improved upon and which is well worth stating in the words in which it appeared originally:

"At last, in the report of the Committee on the Irish Land Acts, we have some frank confessions on the practical working of a most wonderful experiment. Fourteen years ago the Irish administration in Dublin persuaded the Prime Minister, who prevailed on Parliament, to try the plan of delegating to three private gentlemen the absolute power of regulating the price to be paid for the hire of land, with a few insignificant exceptions, over the whole of Ireland. These gentlemen were to be bound by no rules. No principle whatever of valuation was laid down for their guidance. They were free to adopt any principle, or none at all. And, if they did adopt any principle, they were free to conceal it, so that even criticism might be balked. From their decisions on the question of value no appeal lay to any Court or any authority whatever. They might, if they liked, raise rents to the highest competitive rates, or, on the other hand, they might reduce them to mere nominal amounts. If there was any security at all against the error of over-estimating rents, it lay entirely in a presumption that the whole spirit of the experiment was avowedly in the interest of the tenant, and

for the purpose, if possible, of bestowing fixity of tenure on every tenant indiscriminately, whether good, bad, or indifferent; and this obviously could only be secured by fixing rents so low that neither laziness, nor ignorance, nor want of capital could make it otherwise than easy to pay. Beyond this necessary bias towards the lowest possible scale of rent—a bias inseparable from the initial impulse with which the Triumvirate were started on their way—they had nothing whatever to guide them, and we, the public, had nothing whatever to guide us in even guessing what their course would be. We had, indeed, the personal character of the chosen Triumvirs, and they were all known to be at least respected and honest men. We had also the presumption that such men would almost unconsciously adopt the general principles of valuation which are known in every civilised country in the world respecting the value of land, as well as respecting the value of all other things. But even this presumption was rendered doubtful by one very awkward circumstance. As the Bill was drawn up by Mr. Gladstone, and as he introduced it in the House of Commons, he had taken some care that this presumption in favour of acknowledged rules and principles of valuation should be secured. He did lay down in his Bill the only intelligible principle of all valuations as the principle by which the Triumvirate should be bound. He even made a great fuss about it in his introductory speech. He declared that the Government had thought it “their duty” to lay down a principle of valuation for the guidance of the new tribunal, and even twitted the Conservative Opposition with a manifest reluctance to follow his virtuous example. What was the use—what was even the meaning—of telling three men to fix ‘fair rents’ all over Ireland, unless Parliament gave them at least some indication of what is meant by ‘fair’? Value is everywhere a fact—were they to be free to turn it into a pure fancy? Were the Triumvirs to be at liberty to set all known criteria

aside? The Prime Minister did not think so. He foresaw the danger, and accordingly he considered it to be a duty to insert in his Bill a statutory direction as to a rule by which the Triumvirs should be guided. Here is that direction:— ‘A fair rent means such a rent as, in the opinion of the Court after hearing the parties and considering all the circumstances of the case, holding, and district, a solvent tenant would undertake to pay one year with another.’ This is clear. It indicates market values as at least the basis of all decisions on the fairness of rents. In the nature of things there can be no other. There is a common notion that what are called ‘customary’ values are in their own nature something quite different from market values. But this is quite erroneous. What gives rise to custom? What fixes it—what modifies and changes it? Push these questions and *we shall find that what other men will give for anything is the basis of all values, whether fixed by formal contract or by custom only.* Mr. Gladstone’s definition, therefore, of what he meant by a ‘fair’ rent was equally unassailable in principle and indispensable in practice. Without it the Triumvirate would be absolutely without chart or compass. The whole property of both landlord and tenant would be left wholly at their mercy and discretion, without check or limit of any kind.

“Yet what happened? The Government found the maintenance of this clause inconvenient, in the face of the Irish members whom they wished to conciliate. It was therefore weakly abandoned in Committee. The words indicating market values as even the basis of computation for ‘fair’ rents were simply struck out. It is needless to say that the abandonment of such a clause, after it had been introduced as an acknowledged duty, might be construed as more significant than if it had never been introduced at all. If the Triumvirate, or any one of them, felt himself at all hampered in estimating values by the traditional principles of all time

and all countries, he could remember the fact that the very idea of natural or market value had been deliberately excluded by Parliament, even as guiding him at all in the exercise of his own arbitrary discretion. The result, therefore, was that the Triumvirate have been, and are, absolute dictators on all rent values in Ireland. There is no Court which can, on this matter, call their conduct into question. I have found it always difficult to get anybody to fully realise this fact, or still more to see its sweep and operation. But there is no doubt whatever that it is a fact. It is corroborated by a striking part of the speech with which Mr. Justice O'Hagan, the first chief Triumvir, opened his so-called 'Court' in 1881:—'Neither shall we be tempted,' he said, 'to speak of what may be expected from the actual working of the tribunal. Words on *that* theme will be more seasonably spoken a twelvemonth hence—still more so a quarter of a century hence—than on this day. No doubt such a Court stands in a very different position from other Courts of long-established jurisdiction and settled methods—Courts whose province is to decide on rights defined by law, and which are guided by long lines of precedents and all the wisdom of past experience. We have been likened to navigators in unknown seas, to those whom the poet describes as seeking their way darkly, beneath the night, and through the shadow—"Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbras".'"

The history given is most instructive. It is illustrative of the "original righteousness," so to speak, of Mr. Gladstone, and, at the same time, of the weak opportunism which, at all times during his political career, enabled him to give up and concede points which he felt to be vital and essential to justice. His primary principle, that rents must be regulated by values, or by competition among solvent tenants, was sound enough; but the Irish members, who had their very *raison d'être* as instruments for the plunder of landowners,

naturally would have none of his principle, indefinite as it was. Indefinite, we say, because the moment you abolish competition by Act of Parliament, you render it more and more difficult day after day and year after year to ascertain what the results of competition would be. But the Irish members were shrewd enough to see that, since the most ruinous incubus which a landowner can lay upon his shoulders is an insolvent tenant, and since even a landowner of purely commercial instincts will never pay attention to the competition of any candidates for tenancy whom he does not believe, after making all inquiry possible, to be solvent, the Bill, if carried in its original form, would not only give nothing to their clients, but might even add to their obligations. For it is admitted on all hands, even by the advocates of a Land Court in Wales—who certainly will not admit anything except an absolutely uncontestable fact, and sometimes deny even that—that in Wales as elsewhere the standard of rental which competition among solvent tenants would establish is in very numerous cases tempered by wise generosity as matters stand now. The restriction of competition in the case of vacant farms (for no attention is ever paid to competition for farms occupied by satisfactory tenants) comes from the landowners themselves. Therefore, said the Irish members to themselves, if we assent to a law enabling and provoking every landowner to have his rents fixed by the competition of the solvent, the result will be that few rents, if any, will be reduced while a great many will be increased.

In fact the Act, if it had been allowed to continue to include Mr. Gladstone's original principle, could have worked no injustice for several years; but its introduction would have been quite pointless and, in time, injurious; indeed, it must have become impossible to administer, because if, at one and the same time, you put an end to the competition of the solvent and declare that a Court shall follow the lines laid

down by the competition of the solvent, you lay upon the Court the obligation of following in later years a principle of which you destroy by degrees every visible feature.

In short, whether the Legislature ordains that the lines to be established by competition of the solvent shall be followed, or whether it is content to rely upon the opinions of individual Commissioners or judges, it is clear that the result must, in the long run, be the same; that is to say, the rent must be fixed in the long run and, after the competition of the solvent has ceased to exist and can no longer be used as a guide, in accordance with human whims and fancies.

"No doubt," says the Duke, "the tribunal has acted conscientiously. But so did the Inquisition. So did the Star-chamber." But man is so constituted that he desires to be governed by a definite and ascertainable system of law and not in accordance with the opinions of this man or that; and such Courts as these, unworthy of the name really, will never be tolerated by the majority of men unless they are distinctly favourable to the interests of the majority.

It will be said, however, that Courts following this happy-go-lucky principle or no-principle have "done good." This usually means that they have done what was expected of them by the time-serving legislators who established them and have reduced rents. Certainly they have done so both in Ireland and in the crofting areas of Scotland. Lord Carrington, indeed, did not fail to confront the Duke of Argyll, after he had come to the end of his thorough exposition of the fallacies of the Crofters Acts, with the suggestion that his rents from crofts had been reduced compulsorily by the Crofters Commission to the extent of some 30 per cent. The suggestion was made with studied and almost excessive courtesy, considering that it could not fail to give pain to His Grace. But the admission which the Duke was compelled to make helped Lord Carrington's argument not a jot and for two reasons. First, the British mind is not yet educated up

to the idea that to take money forcibly out of one man's pocket and put it into the purse of another is necessarily or even probably to "do good." Next it remains to be considered whether the mischiefs which must necessarily follow, as we shall show presently, from the establishment of such a system, are not so serious as to counterpoise and cancel the immediate pecuniary benefit which undoubtedly accrues to the sitting tenant from the confiscation of part of his landlord's property for his benefit.

One more puerile theory of "fair rent" must be disposed of before we proceed to enumerate these great mischiefs which must follow inevitably upon the creation of the Court of Conscientious Confiscation. That theory may be described as the "live and thrive" theory. Hundreds of questions were put by Commissioners and others, and hundreds of statements were made by witnesses, which showed clearly that the "live and thrive" doctrine was present in their minds. Elaborate particulars of the ages of tenants suffering from alleged grievances, of the disadvantages from which they suffered by possessing too many children, or not enough of them (a matter entirely beyond the proper control of landlords), of the disadvantages of early widowhood, of the losses of cattle and so forth were given. These, no doubt, as the evidence showed abundantly, are matters which landowners do, in a very great number of cases, take into account. But certainly no Court could pay attention to them and no sane Parliament could direct or permit a Court to have regard to them. Even supposing a Legislature so infatuated as to crystallise the "live and thrive" notion of rent into law, the law would by no means take the form which the witnesses belonging to the agitator class for the most part seem to imagine. It would certainly not go on the principle that, when a farmer has paid his expenses and keep, and maintained his family (of indefinite dimensions), and put something away for a rainy day, the balance of the year's receipts might be

regarded as rent. In that whimsical time the skilful and sturdy bachelor would have to pay a higher rent than the reckless married man, and the childless couple would be drawn upon more heavily than Mr. and Mrs. Quiverful; and this, which is a survey of the concrete facts lying under this vague exposition of the "live and thrive" theory, is absurd. In this connection it is prudent to observe the theory of rent held, or, at any rate, the practice followed, by public authorities. The acquisition of land by public authorities to sub-let in small holdings is presumed to entail no loss upon the ratepayers, who are practically the landlords, and the land so obtained is supposed to be let "not at something which may be left out of the proceeds after various other claims have been paid," but "at such a sum per annum as will cover the payment made by the public authority and entail no loss on the ratepayers." No ratepayers would become responsible for repayment of the principal and interest under the "live and thrive" rent idea, so why should a private individual be expected to lend his capital on such absurd terms?

But supposing the theory defined thus "the rent ought to be such a sum as upon an average of years a farmer of average skill and possessed of adequate capital ought to be able to pay after making a reasonable profit for himself over and above his keep and expenses," we should soon be driven to absurdities. For the first consequence must be that the rent of all the small tenements—very numerous in Wales—which are the labourer's stepping-stones to larger farms, because by their means he can add to his income as a labourer, would be wiped away at one stroke; and, in any event, landowner and tenant are far more likely than external authority to come to a right conclusion on a matter of this kind. For the rest this system, if it were worthy of the name, would be open to all the objections of any compulsory system of fixing rents. And these are the mischiefs which would follow of necessity:

1. All friendliness of feeling between landowner and tenant would be destroyed.

This is a forecast justified by experience, for it is a common saying in the law courts that no litigation is so ruinously obstinate as that which has relation to rights of way, or water, or common, or anything connected with land; and the writer, knowing Wales as well as most men living, or, to use the pompous phrase of Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P., having been "a tolerably diligent student" of Welsh affairs, will venture to say that subsequent reconciliation between litigants is almost, if not absolutely, unknown.

It must be admitted, however, that this would be no argument in the eyes of the conductors of the *Baner* and other vernacular papers; of Mr. Gladstone, who invented the famous comparison between the classes and the masses; of Mr. Thomas Ellis, who went back to 1859 to inflame the House of Commons against the landowners, whom he alleged to have exercised "relentlessly their power of notice to quit to keep up rents;" and proceeded to speak of the "ignorance" and the "obstinacy" of these landowners (who, such of them as are Welsh, enjoy for the most part the same educational opportunities as their English fellows). But we do not address ourselves to Mr. Ellis and Mr. Gee. We appeal to men of reason and sense, who, knowing the innumerable kindnesses done by tenant to landowner, as well as by landowner to tenant, appreciating the value of friendly feeling between the two classes, and the peril of smouldering enmity, will not wilfully destroy that which tends unquestionably to the national good. And if it be asked why this result must ensue, the answer is plain; it is that these men feel unanimously that State interference with them in the management of property which they and their ancestors have collected, very often by purchase, in the course of many centuries, would be an unpardonable wrong.

2. The landowner would become a mere rent-charger, who

would have no interest in residing upon or improving his estate.

This forecast is denied by Mr. Gee, Mr. Ellis, and Mr. Bryn Roberts. Against their opinions we venture to set those of virtually every landowner or agent who was examined before the Commission on the subject. After all, the men who are interested in land may be taken to be better judges of the feelings of the class to which they belong than outsiders and Members of Parliament who have their own schemes to puff. Against the gentlemen named, therefore, we place in the balance great landowners like Mr. Wynne of Peniarth, Mr. Nanney, Mr. Price of Rhiwlas, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Penrhyn, Mr. E. Davies of Plas Dinam, and Colonel Cornwallis West; and since the evidence for the great estates was given mainly by agents of great experience, such men as Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West, Captain N. P. Stewart, Mr. W. B. C. Jones, Mr. Prichard, Major Birch, Captain Preston, Colonel Hughes of Ystrad, Mr. St. John Charlton, Mr. Forrester Addie, Mr. Owen Slaney Wynne, and many others besides might be cited in testimony. But, if it be desired to know how great landowners would feel and in what spirit they would act if a Land Court were established, it is surely enough to quote the representatives of Lord Penrhyn, Mr. Assheton Smith, Mr. Ellis Nanney, Sir George Meyrick, Mr. Cooke of Gwysanau, Sir Richard Bulkeley, Lady Neave, Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, Mr. Hughes of Kimmel, and Lord Powis; and to add to their testimony that of every landowner in North Wales who gave evidence on the matter. Perhaps it may be added here that, while all landowners and agents might have expressed the case against a Land Court on this ground equally thoroughly and logically, it was not to be desired that more than two or three should go into the details of the argument, and that of these, Mr. Edward Davies of Plas Dinam, from whom, as an ardent Liberal by tradition, the revolutionary

party expected a good deal, and Colonel Cornwallis West, a Liberal Unionist, were among the most complete and convincing.

These men, then, know what they would do under given circumstances better than outsiders. That is to say they would allow or request the Land Court to fix rents all round, and they would put an absolute stop to all expenditure on improvements and repairs. Thus, even if there were a considerable reduction in rents at starting, they would, as reference to our later sketch of what the evidence given before the Commissioners shows that landowners have done for the country, be financial gainers by the transaction. And their course would be in accordance with ordinary motives of human conduct, for, when all has been said, it is unreasonable to expect a man to expend money in the improvement of a subject-matter, land to wit, when he well knows that he is to be debarred by law from having so much as a voice in settling the price which is to be paid for the hire of that land afterwards, and that he is to be debarred from obtaining, at a pinch, the price fixed by supply and demand or by the higgling of the market.

Nor is this merely argument based upon study of human nature, or upon the statements made by landowners as to their probable action in the event of the establishment of such a Court, for there is evidence, given before the Commission as to the history of Irish land, which serves as an instructive guide. Such is the evidence of Mr. Preston, who has experience of the Irish Land Courts, and declared at Llangefni that they satisfied neither landowner nor tenant; and that, in his opinion, landowners in Wales, under a Land Court, would not be more likely than landowners in Ireland to spend money on improvements and repairs. Why, indeed, judged by the ordinary human standard, should they?

It was in relation to this evidence of Captain Preston that Professor Rhys, on the 26th day of the sittings of the

Commission, and asking the twenty-one-thousand-eight-hundred-and-thirtieth question—spoke thus :

“Then, a question was put by Mr. Vincent just now as to a Land Court. I am very hazy about this Land Court question, I must confess, and I am very glad to hear anything I can about it. Supposing a Land Court were ever to be established in Wales, must it go exactly on the lines of the Irish Land Court?—I hope not.

“We have had it in evidence, I think, that the Crofters Commission would supply a better model in regard to land tenure in Wales. Are you acquainted with the working of the Crofters Act?—I cannot say that I am.”

So far the eminent antiquarian scholar seems to have been hazy indeed and, it may be added, the Crofters Commission had barely been mentioned before the Welsh Land Commission. But there was plenty of evidence about it afterwards, evidence from the Scotch Office, which appeared to be too weak for the stomach of the Commissioners. This was supplemented later by that of the head of the Crofters Commission, who could not be expected to foul his own nest; by evidence from Mr. D. Macrae, ex-elementary-schoolmaster in the Highlands and now the professional, or quasi-professional, crofter's friend; by evidence also from the Duke of Argyll, who differed absolutely from these gentlemen. And the result was plain enough; namely, that the difference between the two systems is one of name and machinery only. Both have the same essential and objectionable feature, compulsory fixing of rent at the request of either party, and both, for that reason, must and do produce the same mischiefs.

3. Improvement by mutual agreement between landowner and tenant would become impossible, and “improvement leases,” under which the tenant obtains the land for a period

at less than market price on condition of effecting certain improvements would come to an end.

About such improvement leases Professor Rhys seems also to have been hazy, for certainly he used words in the form of a question which pointed to an opinion in his mind that such leases partook of the nature of a landowner's device to sweat the tenant. Like Mr. Richard Jones in another place we "cannot follow his process of reasoning." Such leases, which have been common in parts of Denbighshire, are, it is submitted with confidence, beneficial alike to landowner, tenant, and the general public, which is deeply interested in the improvement of the productive power of land.

4. The establishment of a Land Court involves as of necessity (*see* Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West's evidence at Carnarvon) the conferment by statute upon the sitting tenant of fixity of tenure, and, as an inevitable corollary, his obtaining the power of selling the right of occupation subject to the judicial rent. Thus the selling price of the freehold must be reduced.

Now it is contended, and will be proved in due course, that the Welsh tenantry in practice do possess all reasonable fixity of tenure, and that, since the days before the Ballot Act (concerning which days the evidence was misty and out of date), no case of capricious eviction has been proved distinctly, although many have been alleged and absolutely disproved, not merely by verbal but also by documentary evidence. It has been proved further that upon *all* the great estates, and it might easily be proved of hundreds of lesser properties, holdings do, as a matter of practice and grace, continue to be held by successive members of the same families from generation to generation.

But the establishment of a Land Court clearly involves the giving of fixity of tenure by law ; for, in the absence of such statutory fixity of tenure, the landowner might (it is not suggested that he would) give notice to the tenant who, by apply-

ing to the Land Court, obtained a judicial rent less than the market rent. Now between a landowner's position surrounded by a body of tenantry whom he desires to keep but of divers of whom he may, if he is advised that it will be to the benefit of the community, rid himself and the neighbourhood, and that of a landowner who is surrounded by a body of men of whom he cannot rid himself save for certain definite reasons which must be proved in a Court of Law, probably at great expense, there is a vast difference. And that difference may be measured in money. In all classes of life there are, unfortunately, to be found surly and ill-conditioned persons who may, none the less, be irreproachable from the commercial point of view. Can it be expected that the intending purchaser of an estate will give as much for land upon which he may find himself saddled with such a tenant as for land with which he is free—subject to the condition that he shall compensate an outgoing tenant adequately—to deal as he pleases? It is this freedom, this latent power, if the phrase be preferred, which contributes to give to land a higher price in the market than it could conceivably possess as an interest-bearing investment. To take it away, on the pretext that it might be used capriciously, when in fact there is no evidence that it has been so used in modern times, when it is clear that the result must be a depreciation of the selling value of land would be the more foolish, as well as unjust, having regard to a pet scheme of the Commissioners, a morally certain recommendation of theirs which will be dealt with after a very few sentences have been written.

First, however, it is desirable to show how "free sale" which is the inevitable corollary to "fair rents" as "fixity of tenure" is the inseparable accident of a Land Court, must depreciate the selling value of land. This can hardly be done better than in the words of Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West at Carnarvon—the interrogating Commissioner being Sir John Llewelyn.

"12,200. Can you give the Court your opinion as to the effect of what we have heard of a proposed Land Court?—No, I have not been asked.

"12,201. Will you kindly tell us your opinion about what its effect might be?—As to whether it would be good or not?

"12,202. Yes.—Personally I believe it would be productive of more harm than good. It seems to me that a Land Court necessarily implies freedom of sale, and, of course, fixity of tenure. If a Land Court fixes the rent it is pretty certain to be—it must be—below market value, what could be got by a competitive rent. It would be no use if it was not. Then if that was arbitrarily fixed there would arise a value between the actual rent and the selling value of it, the market value of it. Now who would that belong to? If it belonged to the tenant for making his improvements he ought to have power to sell it. If it did not it ought to belong to the landlord. Therefore it implies the necessity for giving the tenant power to sell that margin. Then if he sells that margin it comes to the same thing that I have said before, that the next man has to pay the market value for his farm, counting the interest on the money which he has paid for that margin between the two. Fixity of tenure would necessarily follow because the landlord could not have the power to turn out the tenant who had had his rent fixed or else he would turn him out at once, possibly when the judicial rent was fixed, and see if he could not agree with another man to take it at a higher rent. Therefore I think a Land Court implies the whole. There is nothing between the two, between complete freedom of sale, complete fixity of tenure, and taking, in fact, the whole thing out of the hands of the landlord. Further than this, as to fixity of tenure, I have never heard it defined as to whether it is fixity of tenure on both sides, that is to say, whether a tenant is to be at liberty to throw his land on his landlord's.

hands at a most inconvenient time and demand compensation for the improvements which he has made without his consent, or whether the landlord is to have the same fixity of tenure and say: 'You shall not go now.'

On this point Mr. Richard Jones harried Colonel West a little; but made nothing of his enterprise, for the position is unassailable.

Now "free sale" has been proved so often to be productive of endless mischiefs in Ireland, to be simply a money bribe to the sitting tenant at the expense of the landowner, and an intolerable encumbrance to every succeeding tenant, that it is not necessary to give more than a couple of instances by way of proof. For one of them a debt is due to the researches of the Duke of Argyll into the Report already mentioned (*The Times*, December 4th, 1894). It may be summarised thus: On October 10th, 1894, Connel Ryan applied to the Land Tribunal at Limerick, Judge Adams presiding, for the fixing of a "fair rent" for his holding of four acres seven perches, which were rented at £3 5s. or less than 16s. per acre. The judge discovered that under the Act of 1881, *Ryan had paid £200, or more than sixty years' purchase, for the tenant-right.* Yet the judge reduced his rent to £2 10s. A piece of more flagrantly Irish and illogical injustice it is impossible to conceive. The landowner was mulcted of nearly a third of the property left to him by a confiscatory statute simply because the tenant had given to his predecessor an absolutely insane price for the property of which the Act had divested the landowner.

An analogous and well authenticated case is extracted from the *Irish Times*.

"MARKET VALUE OF TENANTS' HOLDINGS.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Irish Times*.

"SIR,—After the remarkable evidence given to the Evicted

Tenants Commission, it may interest some of your readers to learn that, notwithstanding the present temporary depression in the price of cattle and the rumour of a further compulsory reduction of rents, the market value of the tenants' interest in their holdings is rather on the increase than otherwise.

"Within the last month a small holding in County Leitrim, half-way between Mohill and Carrigallen, subject to a judicial rent fixed in 1883 of £9 10s. was sold for £300, which, with auctioneer's fees and costs of conveyance, amounted to £330, or nearly thirty-four times the rent.

"In a still poorer locality, in same county, half-way between Carrigallen and Ballinamore, a miserable holding, subject to £3 10s. rent (since reduced to £3), was sold last week for £50. On neither holding were there any reclamations or improvements beyond the usual mud and straw cabins.

"These prices are not exceptional. Holdings are changing hands every day at from 16 to 30 years' purchase, calculated on their rents, in County Leitrim, Roscommon, and Cavan, and higher still in the better lands of other counties, and yet we are told that 14 years' purchase of the fee, to be paid by very easy instalments, is too much to give the owners.—
Yours, &c., "J. GARNET TATLOW.

"Cavan, 19th December, 1892."

That you cannot establish a Land Court without involving "free sale" as a corollary—for value cannot be destroyed though it may be transferred—is clear. Equally clear is the substantial nature of the transference and its ruinous after-effect. That is to say, if there be land-hunger, the temptation to take advantage of it is transferred from the owner of an estate who, apart from his position and traditions, is disposed by ordinary prudence to have regard to the injurious effects to his property which must follow on exorbitance, to an outgoing tenant who has no reason for taking the slightest interest in the future of the land which he has left for ever.

No doubt it was some knowledge of what had occurred in Ireland, and what must happen everywhere, until there is some radical change, not merely in the law of the land, but in human nature, which induced Mr. Bryn Roberts, himself the backer of a Land Bill, to repudiate the principle of "free sale" (Q. 13,266). Again, Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P. (Q. 17,080), being a little hard pressed, said that he had never introduced the principle of "free sale" into any Land Bill of his own devising, and said "IT WOULD BE UNWISE, ESPECIALLY IF WE HAD A GOOD LAND BILL, TO SET UP IN WALES THE SYSTEM OF FREE SALE, BECAUSE IT WOULD BE TRANSFERRING THE EVILS OF COMPETITIVE RENTS FROM THE LANDOWNER TO THE TENANT." By this none too lucid expression of dogmatic opinion, Mr. Ellis probably meant that the outgoing tenant would be at least as keenly desirous to exact the uttermost farthing for the tenant-right, as the most needy landowner to obtain the highest competition rent. This view might easily be put more strongly in favour of the landlord; but for the moment that is not the point. The more important matter is that Mr. Ellis, whose political eye is keen enough for short distances, but of no value when long distances come under consideration, fails to see that any Act establishing a Court to fix rents must as a necessary corollary create a right of "free sale" also, and that this must happen whether the words free sale are mentioned in the Act or not.

Now, as it is clear that every interference with the landowner's right to do as he pleases with land which he has bought on terms of freedom, impairs the selling price of land, so it is abundantly manifest to any intelligent person that every shilling of additional value which accrues to the tenant-right is a shilling taken away from the selling price of the freehold; it is, in fact, a paring away of the freehold as far as it goes. It follows that the Land Court system not only would take away part of the landowner's property and give it to the tenant (a matter which would not distress Mr. Ellis and

his fellows greatly), but would also actually diminish the selling value of land in a substantial and serious fashion. This, again, will appear to the agitators at first sight but a minor matter. But let them reflect upon the great care which the Commissioners gave to the condition of the mortgaged freeholders of Cardiganshire and of some counties in North Wales. Let them remember that the Commission made a special request to Mr. Morgan Richardson to collect statistical evidence on the matter, and that they are practically pledged to recommend the advance of public moneys to these freeholders, on the security of their holdings, upon such terms as will enable them to redeem their property and pay a moderate rate of interest. Let them reflect that Mr. Morgan Richardson is a man of great experience in these matters, who receives and pays (Q. 43,736) "interest on something between a quarter and half a million of money which is invested on mortgage" in the neighbourhood of Cardigan. And this is what he had to say on the matter:

"43,827. The following questions are handed up by Mr. Vincent: Is it not your opinion that the establishment of a Land Court would tend to reduce the selling price of land?—Yes, to a certainty.

"43,828. If so, would it be safe for the State, which established a Land Court, to lend money to the mortgaged freeholder?—Not after the Land Court was established. I think you could lend, then, only a much smaller percentage than four-fifths of the purchase-money.

"43,829. Have you not had cases in which arrangements for the advance of money on mortgage have been broken off by reason of agitation?—I have."

This last answer, stating a fact of which Mr. St. John Charlton gave corroborative evidence, is one of some importance; it means that the prominence given to the Welsh Land

Question has had its effect in making investors shy, and in impairing the credit of Welsh landowners. And that means that shrewd men of business like Mr. Morgan Richardson feel that such legislation as is proposed could not fail to diminish the value of Welsh land in the market. It follows that since no man will venture to argue that any diminution of the value of land can be other than general, or that the largest owners can be despoiled without the smallest owners suffering in proportion, the pet scheme of the Commissioners and the one recommendation of theirs which is likely to attract serious attention for the moment, is rendered impossible if a Land Court is to be established.

Lastly, be it observed that, whereas the most substantial and apparently reasonable of the claims, made on behalf of tenants before the Commission, was for a readjustment of the law relating to compensation for unexhausted improvements, the establishment of judicial rents clearly renders it impossible that such compensation should be given. The proper measure of compensation (apart for the moment of all questions as to the owner's right to restrain changes) is to be found in the answer to the question: "By how much have the exertions and expenditure of the tenant raised the competition rent of the holding?" And that is the object aimed at, imperfectly, by the Agricultural Holdings Acts. But, since a Land Court, essentially and *ex hypothesi*, does away with the competition rent, it would be idle to contend that a landowner, debarred from his right to accept that rent, could in any rational community be compelled to pay compensation on that basis. To make a man pay for the improvement in the selling or letting value of land, and at the same time to prohibit him from taking advantage of the improvement which he has been compelled to buy, would be a proceeding contrary to the rudimentary principles of justice.

That there is, without the introduction of anything so

revolutionary as a Land Court, a remedy to be devised capable of meeting all substantial grievances, save those which are purely sentimental, shall be proved to demonstration in due course. But this chapter is too long already and, now that the main objections on the ground of expediency—it is useless in these days to argue on the basis of morality or honesty—have been stated, it may well close by drawing attention to a particular argument which the majority of the Commission is sure to use. It was foreshadowed by Lord Carrington in a question (64,285) addressed to Mr. Thomas Gee, in which his lordship suggested that Major Birch, a very important witness since he had experience of England and Wales, had recommended a new Agricultural Holdings Act for the whole of England and Wales, to take the place of agreements, giving free cultivation and giving protection and compensation to tenants, and protection to landlords to prevent their farms being run out in an unhusbandlike manner, and that this was a very considerable advance in public opinion. (It must be clearly understood that Lord Carrington's free rendering of Major Birch's testimony is not accepted as accurate, although no doubt it was intended to be faithful.) Mr. Gee was perfectly right in answering that Major Birch had not recommended a Land Court, but it is none the less worth while to look back to see what Major Birch did in fact say. He said (62,722): "I do not think (the evidence given in these counties, Flint and Denbigh) at all fairly representative . . . many men have come forward who know that their opinion is of no practical value whatever. . . . They (the bigger farmers) look upon the Commission rather as a Court of grievances than a Court of inquiry." He agreed, indeed, that an Agricultural Holdings Act might be devised which would do away with the necessity for all agreements; but he was careful to add (62,812): "I do not want an Agricultural Holdings Act for Wales only; I want one for England and

Wales." Mr. Llewellyn Jones, who appeared for the party of discontent, again asked (62,826): "Are Welsh farmers rented at a higher figure than English farmers?" and the answer was: "Lower as a rule." And again he said (62,840): "Comparing the English and Welsh estates which I manage, I think it is natural that we should do more for the Welsh tenant than we do for the English tenant." Out of this witness it may not seem likely that the majority of the Commission can make much; but subsequent questions showed clearly that some of them imagined themselves to have extracted from him some admissions favourable to their cause, which are not to be found in the evidence; and it may be that the general dicta on the question of compensation for improvements, and compensation to landowners for waste, may be twisted into a suggestion or recommendation of a special Court to try disputes between landowner and tenant upon questions of this kind, which would be the thin end of that wedge of which the thick end is a Land Court. All comments by the Commission on Major Birch's evidence should therefore be compared scrupulously with the text of the evidence itself, for even the chairman, *vide* his remarks on "a considerable advance of public opinion," seemed to be under some misapprehension as to the words actually used by Major Birch.

CHAPTER VII.

The Agrarian Indictment—its Allegations—(1) Exorbitant Rents and Inadequate Recognition of Depression, (2) Insecurity of Tenure, (3) Sectarian Preference in Choice of Tenants, (4) Rent raised on Tenant's Improvements, (5) over-stringent Agreements, (6) Game Damage, &c., (7) wrongful Enclosure of Commons, (8) Stoppage of Sale of "Goodwill"—some Evidence as to the said "Goodwill."

Evidence as to Raising of Rents—its Vagueness—the Errors made in such Evidence—the Incapacity of the Witnesses—as to borrowing Money to pay Rent—Leading Questions in Commission's Syllabus—Treatment of Witnesses who alleged Landowners to be considerate—Mr. Richard Jones and the Socratic Method—how Farms are valued—Standard lower in Wales than in England—Danger of going by Abatements and Reductions simply—an Important Appendix.

ENOUGH has been written of the disadvantages, the injustices, the mutually contradictory features, and the generally unscientific character of the system of tenure (if "dual ownership" be not the more correct phrase) which the party of agitation desire to substitute for the law of contract tempered by the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1875 and 1883, which at present regulates the relation of landowner and tenant, so far as that relation is dependent on law only.

Let us now summarise the counts of the indictment upon which the party of agitation rest their claim for exceptional legislation of a revolutionary character and, while so summarising, let us distinguish those alleged grievances for which the proposed legislation might, from the point of view of its advocates, be a remedy, from those upon which it

is inconceivable that the suggested change could have any influence whatsoever. Having done this it will be convenient to dispose at once of those points which are susceptible of brief and conclusive treatment and to proceed from them to those which, on the surface at any rate, are of such serious importance as to demand careful analysis of the evidence on either side.

The indictment alleges in effect :

(1) A prevalence through Wales and Monmouthshire of excessive and exorbitant rents together with a failure on the part of landowners in general to meet the recent depression in agriculture by adequate abatements or reductions. This is a grave allegation, and one which must be treated at length. Moreover, if it were true, it would point to the existence of grievances which, in the opinion of a considerable section of politicians, might be remedied by the establishment of a Land Court.

(2) Insecurity of tenure. This again is a serious allegation of grievance for which the legal fixity of tenure that, as has been shown, follows upon the establishment of judicial rents as a necessary corollary, might afford some remedy. It shall be met, we venture to say, convincingly ; shall in fact be disproved.

(3) A preference for Churchmen and Conservatives as against Nonconformists and Radicals when farms become vacant. This allegation is of sufficient gravity to demand special attention since, if such a preference existed, it would certainly create bad feeling. But in any case the grievance would not be one for which a Land Court could provide any remedy, since the wildest witness did not suggest that the selection of tenants should be left to the Land Court.

(4) The raising of rent upon tenants' improvements. Here again the allegation is grave in its original form and requires careful treatment. While it is not denied that for this griev-

ance, if it existed, a Land Court would be an obstacle of a sort, it is abundantly manifest that all possibility of grievance would be removed by an improvement in the law of compensation to tenants for improvements and to owners for waste. Such an improvement is apparently desired on all sides, albeit the doctors differ greatly on points of detail, and, if it were effected, would secure the desired result without involving any of the thousand mischiefs incident to a Land Court.

(5) A tendency on the part of landowners to force upon tenants excessively strict forms of agreement and to embody in those agreements a clause purporting to exclude the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883. This also must be dealt with in some detail.

(6) Refusal to pay for damage done by game, excessive preservation of game and a practice of terrorising the tenantry into allowing the Ground Game Act to be a dead letter. This will be dealt with shortly.

(7) Illegal enclosures of Commons and harsh treatment of squatters. Here again we are far away from the scope over which a Land Court could operate; but the subject is one which requires some little care in treatment.

(8) The discontinuance of an ancient practice of permitting the sale of "goodwill" by outgoing tenants. This last allegation is susceptible of such brief discussion that it may be dealt with at once. No "goodwill" in any accepted sense of the term attaches to an agricultural holding in itself in the ordinary way, and in the exceptional cases in which there is anything like real goodwill the landowner cannot prevent the outgoing tenant from selling it to the incoming tenant. Such goodwill is a purely personal property. For example a farmer may have been in the habit of supplying milk, butter, eggs, meat and so forth to certain customers. The list of such customers is in his hands; he can sell it to whomsoever he pleases for such price as he can get. It is his property; and no landowner could deprive him of

it even if he desired so to do. On the other hand such advantages as attach to a farm from its position in relation to a market town, or railway conveniences, are not in the nature of goodwill but are simply circumstances which the tenant has had no part in bringing to pass. They are attached to the landowner's property and many cases might be adduced in which the landowner has been, partially at any rate, instrumental in bringing them into being by virtue of his enterprise in developing a district.

By "goodwill," however, these persons mean, though they speak inaccurately, what amounts in effect to "tenant right" saleable subject to certain limits. And there is evidence on the subject. Mr. Charles A. Jones at Dolgelley (8413) said :

"I think the outgoing tenant makes the best arrangement he can with regard to the purchase of the stock and the manure with the incoming tenant. It is generally a matter of arrangement. I say, if you can come to terms with the outgoing tenant you can have the farm. There is nothing to be paid for goodwill or anything of that sort, but it is desirable that the same sheep, for instance, should be kept upon the same farm."

Now where this process was accompanied, as was frequently the case in old times, by a preliminary introduction of the new tenant by the old tenant to the landowner and his agent, there was manifestly room for the incomer to pay the outgoer, not only for the value of the improvements, if any, but also something extra for the introduction, if, eventually, his nominee was admitted. Nor was this custom, or rather occasional practice, confined to Merionethshire where the sheep, which know their "walk" on the fenceless mountain and will drive intruding sheep from their tract, have clearly a value greater than they possess as mutton. There is evidence given by Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P., at Carnarvon, to

show that it prevailed on some parts of the Vaynol estate. It was, in fact, a practice which prevailed here and there in old times when agents were men, sometimes, of a very different type to those who, for the most part, have the management of estates now. But it was at best a surreptitious practice, injurious alike to landowner and to incoming tenant, and really partaking of the nature of a fraud on the landowner. The modern agents, clearly seeing the nature and tendency of the transaction, have stamped it out firmly and, seeing that every argument used by Mr. Ellis and Mr. Bryn Roberts against open "free sale" tells directly against this secret and limited sale of tenant right, it is unnecessary for us to urge that its disappearance from those districts in which it formerly prevailed, more or less, is an unalloyed benefit to landowner and tenant. The best of the modern agents make a strict rule of never permitting an introduction to them of a new tenant by the outgoing, because, in such cases, the mischievous proceeding is difficult to prevent; witness the evidence of Colonel Sackville West in answer to Mr. Brynmor Jones.

"12,215. Have any instances come under your notice in which a new tenant has paid anything to the outgoing tenant?—I have heard of such cases, but you cannot prove it, because it is generally done by putting an increased value on the stock.

"12,216. And any such things are rather concealed from you than otherwise, as agent, I suppose.—Invariably."

Finally it is certainly a just observation that the growth of such a custom among tenantry is a curious and significant commentary upon the assertions of agitators that the tenants are at the mercy of their landlords and dare not farm highly or effect improvements lest the fruit of their labour should be confiscated. In fact, it argues a confidence on their

part, which we shall prove to have been well-founded; that no such advantage would or will be taken of them. None the less the custom is mischievous, and agents and owners, particularly small owners, are well advised to be on their guard against it.

And now for the more serious allegation that rents are excessive and exorbitant. The evidence on this point takes various forms. One typical form is to be found in Mr. Ellis's House of Commons speech. He instanced, omitting in characteristic fashion all particulars which might enable his statement to be tested or his outline of facts to be filled in, a farm in Anglesey taken on a lease for life in 1787 at 5s. per acre. (The chances are that a premium was paid, but let that pass.) Then at some date, which Mr. Ellis did not think it worth while to mention, the son of the lessee succeeded, the rent being raised to 10s. and then to 16s. an acre. Then, says Mr. Ellis (accurately, no doubt, so far as his knowledge went, but, as he would, of course, admit, speaking upon matters as to which precise information must be difficult to attain now), the tenant did all manner of improvements, and for ninety-seven years the landowner spent not a penny piece. Finally, during the tenancy of the son's widow, the rent was raised to 23s. per acre. Now, from a practical point of view, this statement, even if we assume Mr. Ellis not only to be absolutely accurate but to have ascertained the whole of the facts (a very generous assumption this last), is worth nothing at all now. Anglesey in 1787, that is to say, more than a century ago was, if not *terra incognita*, something very like it. Railways of course were not; there was not even a bridge to connect the island with the mainland. Anglesey now has excellent roads; is intersected by two lines of railway; and has easy communication with flourishing market towns on the mainland. The value of property has therefore improved, and the farmer's life at 23s. an acre rent may very likely be far more choiceworthy now than it

was in 1787 at 5s. an acre. It may be said that the "increment" in the value of the landowner's property is unearned. That is true enough, but Socialism is not strong enough yet to confiscate unearned increment; and in any case the story requires filling out before it is worth anything. Here are questions to be answered. Was a premium paid for the original lease? Was the rent fixed at 5s. on the first or at 10s. on the second letting (which was cheap enough in all conscience), on the terms that the tenant should effect certain improvements? What is the evidence, which must all of it be hearsay and part of it hearsay upon hearsay, of what the tenant did and that the landowner spent nothing? General statements of this kind, in fact, are worth nothing for practical purposes, for the question, the only question worth considering, is whether the rent of 23s. per acre is reasonable now or not. That is a question which might be answered after survey of the farm itself; for the rate is, as a matter of fact, not excessive for good land in Anglesey.

This example from Mr. Ellis is taken, not from his evidence, but from his speech in the House of Commons; but it is a typical exhibition of the evidence which was laid before the Commission. It will be convenient, perhaps, to give a few examples of the allegations made, more often by strangers and rarely by the persons concerned, in the course of the North Wales evidence. (Q. 7847 forward): Mr. John Morris Jones, a tenant of Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, testified that his grandfather had held at £140; that his father succeeded in 1841; that in 1860 his rent had been raised to £155; that it had been reduced in 1866 to £140. Then came a minor difference as to the substitution of one parcel for another; and he said that finally, in 1882, the rent had been raised £40 on witness succeeding to the tenancy. He admitted that he had received some abatements of 10 per cent., and that his rent had recently been reduced by £50 per annum. Mr. Thomas Davies (7973) gave a list of farms, with their gross

estimated rental in 1869 and 1893 respectively, but admitted both abatements and reductions. Mr. William Pugh (8438) complained that his rent had been raised since 1853. Mr. David Evans complained that his rent had been raised from £28 to £37 10s. (It was afterwards explained that the first rent was subject to payment of tithe by tenant, and the second to payment by landowner.) Mr. Thomas Ellis (8901) observed that in 1850 his rent had been raised from £27 to £28, and again, in 1862, to £32. In 1862 he had taken a second farm for £16 8s., the rent paid by the previous tenant having been £13; and that in 1872, after he had reclaimed some waste land, his rent had been raised further. Mr. Richard Roberts (9341) gave a list of farms on which rents had been raised during the past fifty years.

This kind of extract from evidence might be continued almost *ad infinitum*. But the continuance would be wearisome and meaningless. In very many cases witnesses were proved to be inaccurate in their figures; in many others it was proved to demonstration that there were special and sufficient reasons to account for raising of rent. To adduce a large number of these cases tending to show that erroneous statements have been made either wilfully or through ignorance, pardonable or culpable, were an easy task. But its accomplishment would serve only to cumber the text, and would not touch the main question, which is simply whether rents have been shown to be excessive. Precisely the same observation applies to the evidence, given loosely very often, that rents have been raised generally, in this or that district, during the past fifty years. It should be observed, however, that little as is the value to be attached to that evidence from a practical point of view, even when it is given by a farmer, that little becomes beautifully less when it is given by a tradesman or a Nonconformist minister. No imputation on either of these classes is involved in this statement. The simple fact of the matter is that they have no knowledge of the relations of landowner and tenant,

and that their evidence is worth about as much as that of the bishops and clergy would have been if the landowners had put them forward as witnesses.

The real question is whether rents are excessive; whether they are so fixed that, upon an average of years, a farmer of average skill and business ability, equipped with adequate capital at starting, cannot make a reasonable profit. Be it observed here, and by way of preliminary, that landowners have a right to insist that an incoming tenant shall possess adequate capital, and that, in their own interests, as they have testified time after time, they do take all possible steps to ascertain that he is so endowed before he enters a farm. The matter, however, is one into which it is delicate and difficult to inquire, and over which a landowner or his agent is easily to be deceived. Hence it came out frequently in evidence that tenants entered upon their holdings with the deliberate intention of farming upon borrowed capital. It may perhaps be open to question among reasonable men whether a man is entitled to complain that his rent is excessive merely because after paying interest on borrowed capital (for which, in most cases, having no security to offer, he must pay at a high rate) and after paying the expenses of farming and supporting himself and his family, he finds his rent somewhat difficult to pay.

Again it was frequently urged that rents must be excessive, and farmers must be hard driven, because, it was alleged, they had to borrow money to pay their rents. That the evidence on this point was almost entirely hearsay is not to be imputed for blame to the Commissioners. It was the best evidence they could get, since no man was likely voluntarily to impair his credit by confessing that this was his own position. But the allegation is so old in point of time that it becomes necessary to inquire into its real meaning. It occurs in "Adfyfr's" pamphlet; the columns of the vernacular press at the interesting period from 1886 to 1889 bristle

with it; it is to be found in Mr. Ellis's speech in 1892, in which it is specifically stated that the lenders are the banks. It is therefore clear, since the principles of banking do not differ materially all the world over, that these borrowings are merely for purposes of temporary convenience. A man with surplus stock to sell or produce to take to market thinks that he sees a better opportunity of selling to advantage three or four months ahead. In the interval he borrows from his banker who is not at all likely to lend to him unless he knows—and country bankers know a great deal of their neighbours and are thereby enabled to lend more freely and more profitably than city bankers—that he is a substantial man. It is a little difficult to see the proof of grinding poverty in this fact, for fact it is in some measure, that men borrow money for purposes of temporary convenience and repay it afterwards.

It is not pretended of course that the cry "rents are too high," was not frequently uttered before the Commissioners by farmers and outsiders. Of the outsiders it were mere waste of time to take solemn notice. The opinion of a minister of religion, a grocer, a solicitor or a journalist is worth no more upon this question than the opinion of an artist or a shipbuilder. Still it is not denied that there were numerous farmers (though the Commission did not succeed, as Major Birch observed, in securing the evidence of representative farmers) who raised the cry. Human nature would not have been true to itself if their evidence had taken any other shape. Every man would like to obtain that which he desires at a less rate than he has to pay if it were possible; and Welsh farmers were virtually *asked* to say that their rents were excessive. Here, for example, are some questions from the official syllabus which suggest the expected answers pretty plainly. "Could present rents be maintained if wages were paid in respect of the children's labour?" "What provision is made for them (children) on marriage or

independent settlement in life?" "Are farms let to the highest bidder?" This last proved a somewhat awkward question, for except in the most general form there was no evidence at all that land was ever let to the highest bidder, and, when the Commissioners pressed their theory by further questions, they were confronted with unwelcome answers which occasionally caused them to lose patience. Thus Mr. Richard Jones and Mr. O. Griffiths, a Commissioner and a farmer of 70 acres respectively, held the following dialogue at Llangefni (19,254, forward).

"You say, Mr. Griffiths, that the interests of the farmer and the landlord are identical?—I do.

"So far as you as a tenant are concerned what is your interest, so far as the rent is concerned?—I do not quite understand the question.

"I will put it in this way: Is it not your interest to have the rent as low as you can?—It is.

"What is the interest of the landlord so far as the rent is concerned—to have as much as he can, is it not?—Yes.

"How can you say that the interests are identical?—If the tenant will go back (i.e., *if the tenant's circumstances grow worse*) the landlord will, because he depends on it. That is what I mean—he depends on the tenant. He depends on land through the tenant.

"Is that your explanation?—Yes, and in that way I think they are.

"Do you think that your farm would let for more money?—Yes, it would.

"Do you feel that you are living on the generosity of your landlord?—We agree together very well.

"Will you answer my question? Do you feel that you are living on the generosity of your landlord if you think that your farm would command a higher rent?—Well, I do to some extent—yes.

"I will ask you this question: which would you rather receive, £10 as charity or £10 as a matter of justice?—I do not know; I would prefer charity as well as justice.

"Would you rather have charity?—Charity as well as justice."

Mr. Jones's method was Socratic, a relic no doubt of his education at Aberystwith; but we may safely leave the reader to form his own opinion on the question whether the Commissioner or the plain Anglesey farmer had the better of the encounter.

This kind of thing happened time after time, and the *viva voce* evidence proved incontestably, not only that the letting of farms to the highest bidder was virtually unknown, but that the tenants as a body were well aware that they held their farms at less than the market rent. It is introduced in full, merely to show the kind of reception which met men who presumed to express themselves satisfied with their rents and unwilling to see any attempt made to establish judicial machinery for the fixing of rents. There were, to their credit be it said, many score of such tenants, substantial men who stood in no dread of landowner, preacher or politician who came forward with evidence of this character. Such men were the tenants of Sir Watkin mentioned earlier, whom Mr. Brynmor Jones cross-examined. Another instance was Mr. Edward Roberts, a farmer on the Hafodunos Estate (64,377), another Mr. John Jones (64,473) and large numbers elsewhere. The encouragement offered to them by the majority of the Commission was, to say the least of it, not great, and there can be no doubt that they represent the vast majority of the tenantry who, regarding the proceedings of the Commission with apathy and indifference, took no notice of its passage through the county in which they resided.

The evidence therefore of farmers upon the question whether rents in Wales are excessive or not may be summed

up by saying that a large number of tenants, having every encouragement offered to them, asserted that rents were excessive, while many others, not quite so numerous but certainly equally representative, expressed the opinion that, hard as present times are, rents are not on the whole unfair. Of this evidence the first section was given clearly in accordance with interest, the second was given, so far as mere rent went, against interest; for the tenants were always encouraged to think, as in the case just quoted at length, that the proposed legislation would result in a general reduction of rents.

Very much more important really was the evidence as to the manner in which rent is really fixed. Let us take the words of Mr. W. B. C. Jones, as competent a man as is to be found in Wales, albeit, since he has all the courage of his opinions, he did not please the majority of the Commissioners, of whom, indeed, he got rather the better. "I walked every field with him (the tenant), walked the mountain with him, and discussed matters with him, and my figures came out at what they have been stated" (8710). Again (10,377): "The rent is fixed by valuation on this estate by a practical valuer and a tenant farmer." This is practically the universal system whenever there is occasion to readjust the original rent, either because there is a change of tenancy or for other reasons; but it is clear, none the less, that the valuer must have a mental regard for the market value, *i.e.*, the rent which the farm would fetch if offered for competition among solvent candidates for tenancy; although he needs not to be guided absolutely by that and, in the interests of the estate, the rent is kept below the competition rent.

Is the standard of valuation for purposes of rental higher or lower in Wales than in England? Major Birch, as we have seen—and there is no higher authority—thinks that it is lower, and that more is done for the Welsh tenant than for the English. The question is, however, exceedingly difficult

to answer even with regard to adjoining estates, as was well illustrated by Mr. Walter Jones. It must always be remembered that the rent is not the only incident of tenancy. On some estates it is the practice for the owner to do all repairs and improvements at his own cost; on others, on some of the Anglesey estates for example, he supplies materials only; sometimes the tenant is expected to do the haulage, sometimes he is not. Arithmetical comparison is therefore apt to be exceedingly misleading. Thus Mr. Walter Jones, in answer to the question whether there was uniformity of rents, a question inserted for some obscure reason, since a man is concerned only with his own liability, and not with that of his neighbour, said (10,327): "It is very unequal. Rent is much influenced by the question what the landlord is to do, and does, and what the tenant is to do and does. If the latter does everything, his rent is something *plus* what he pays to the owner. If the owner does everything the rent is something minus what the tenant pays him." The interval between these two positions is of course divided into numberless spaces. The same observation, that arithmetic, although itself infallible, must not be treated as an absolute guide, applies to the further question whether abatements or reductions are adequate or inadequate, a question which Mr. Griffiths was apt to put in this crude form: "Do you think now that 10 per cent. is a sufficient reduction for these hard times?" Mr. Grove, too, with that implicit faith in figures natural to a man whose life's work has been devoted to them, was prone to put the same question. But it was really meaningless and inconclusive, for the question whether a reduction is adequate or no depends entirely upon the moral quantity, so to speak, of the original obligation which is reduced, or upon other circumstances. This cannot be put better than in the form of a question which was put by landowners' counsel to a hostile Pembrokeshire witness—no such question was put in North Wales.

Q. 31,036. "Would you not rather be on his (Sir Owen Scourfield's) estate without an abatement than on some estates with a large abatement?—A. Indeed I would."

There is the whole thing in a nutshell ; there is the danger of being misled by arithmetic into the conclusion that an owner has not done his duty, has not recognised adequately the needs of his tenants, when in fact that conclusion can be justified only, if at all, after careful inquiry into the exact circumstances of each particular case, and anxious consideration of the precise force of each one of them. Still, figures can do something, and it is claimed that the exact tables in the Appendix showing abatements, reductions, and the history of rental on a very large number of estates in North Wales do prove beyond question that North Wales landowners have shown warm and substantial sympathy for the tenant farmers during the period of depression. It is claimed that these figures, procured for the Commission with great labour, and deterrent as they are in appearance, form by far the most valuable part of the evidence offered to the Commission. Of their authenticity there is no doubt. They were one and all sent in to the late Mr. George Owen by landowners or agents under their own hands. He testified also to the fact that no discretion had been used in the selection of them. No return which came to him was omitted ; all, good, bad, or indifferent, were submitted to the Commission ; and the result is one in which the landowners of North Wales, when they consider the vast acreage covered by the returns, and the record of money given back freely and willingly, may well feel honest pride. It goes without saying, of course, that this is not all the merit which may honestly be claimed for them. All these figures must be considered in connection with the account of money spent otherwise for the benefit of the tenants, and without increase of remuneration to the landowner, which is dealt with in another chapter.

CHAPTER VIII.

Alleged Insecurity of Tenure—Microscopic Evidence of Capricious Eviction—1858 and 1868 too long ago—Accusations of Canvassing against Landowners and Agents—not proved, but why should they refrain?—The True Answer found in Tables of Hereditary Tenancy—Evidence in Detail from many Estates.

THE next statement made by the persons who aver that things are not as they should be, and that the law regulating the relation of landowner and tenant is based upon some terribly wrong principle, is that tenure or tenancy is so insecure, and that recognition of its insecurity is so general, that farmers dare not farm to the best advantage lest they should receive notices to quit, or their rents should be raised upon their own improvements, or circumstances, foreseen or unforeseen, should bring about a sale of the whole or part of the estate upon which their holdings are situate. Therefore, it is said, they say, we must have fixity of tenure before we can farm highly; and since fixity of tenure involves the settling of rents by external authority (for there is no sense in giving a man fixity of tenure if his rent may be raised indefinitely) they are thus made in effect to claim a Land Court. Now this argument, that if tenure were legally more secure, cultivation might be better, is plausible enough to have influence upon many minds. It may therefore be as well to point out that if there be any timidity of this kind, which is by no means admitted, an absolute remedy and cure for it is to be found, not in the establishment of a Land Court and a statute conferring fixity of tenure, with their attendant evils, but, in an amendment

of the law of compensation for improvements. A man could hardly be heard to say that he dared not improve as he might if, in the event of a termination of the tenancy, he were assured of full compensation for all the advantage honestly added to the land by virtue of his exertions.

But let us look and see whether there is any foundation for the primary allegation that, as a matter of fact, tenancy is insecure. The allegation divides itself under two heads—(a) it is said that tenants feel insecure because their holdings may be brought into the market at any time; (b) it used to be said habitually, in the days when general statements could be made without being tested, that tenants were ejected from their holdings for capricious and political reasons. With the first head we need not be troubled now since it clearly comes under the question of compensation.

After an exhausting pilgrimage with the Commission through North Wales* it is fortunately possible to write that not a single authenticated and un rebutted case of capricious eviction has been brought home to any landowner, small or great; and that the only two cases of anything which might be misconstrued into eviction for political reasons were that of a man, who is admitted to have received notice to quit, on Sir Watkin Williams Wynn's estate, because he absolutely refused to pay the tithe rent-charge, and that of another man on the Kimmel estate, who was caused to leave for the same reason.

Almost the whole of the evidence upon the point of politics relates back to the elections of 1858 and 1868; and, so far as these elections go, it is proposed, in accordance with the principles laid down in an earlier chapter, to deal with the events resulting from them in a very cursory manner by saying that, in 1896 and with a Ballot Act and a Corrupt Practices Act in force, it really matters nothing from the practical point

* This has since been admitted by Mr. Brynmor Jones in the Commons.

of view what was done so long ago and under conditions so entirely different from those which are present now.

It is a singular thing, and one reflecting some credit on landowners as a body, that the researches of the party of agitation into these matters should have been so absolutely barren of modern results. Thus, if we take the most extreme witnesses of all—viz., Mr. Ifan T. Davies, Calvinistic Methodist Preacher (6800), Mr. Thomas Ellis, M.P. (16,910), Mr. Thomas Gee, Calvinistic Methodist Minister and newspaper proprietor, of Denbigh, and Mr. David Owen, solicitor, of Bangor (20,005), and Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P., at Carnarvon, it is really nothing less than astounding to find that they are absolutely wanting in modern instances of the particular species of tyranny which they, or some of them, had declared in public to be practised so universally that all courage was actually ground out of the people's hearts. Yet no men could be better placed to obtain that information which the Commissioners would have accepted gladly enough. If the facts had existed, surely Mr. Ellis, Mr. Bryn Roberts, with his long experience and extensive practice as a solicitor in a rural district, Mr. David Owen, a man in like position, and Mr. Gee, of all men in the world, would surely have brought forward all that could be so brought. In truth there was nothing to bring forward, and the few specific cases in which an attempt was made to prove this grievance broke down miserably. So weak, indeed, was the case for the prosecution in this respect, that the majority of the Commissioners were obliged to push their attack upon landowners and agents forward until it rested upon a foundation of theory which was curiously novel. They asked often, for example, whether landowners and their agents canvassed voters at election times. The underlying suggestion clearly was that, for some inscrutable reason, men in their position were prohibited from the legitimate use of such influence as belonged to them. In an ideal world, perhaps, this might be the case,

for, in such a world, every voter would exercise his franchise carefully, and after thought upon the thousand and one problems of the day. But in the working world of to-day that stage of perfection has not been reached, and it is not a little hard to follow the chain of reasoning which can lead any man to the conclusion that a landowner or an agent ought not, so long as he keeps within the limits laid down by the law, to persuade men to give their votes in this or that way, while a Dissenting minister, who has very great influence, or a tradesman or a lawyer, is to be held up as an apostle of the light if he strains every nerve to induce men to vote on the Radical side. As a matter of fact, however, the evidence tending to show that landowners and agents *did* use their freedom to canvas was so thin and scanty as to be almost undiscoverable. No more need be said of it than that, if the position had been proved, or had appeared to be proved, it would have been mere waste of time to attempt to prove the negative.

One specific case of alleged eviction for political reasons was the Parcia Rhos case, to which earlier allusion has been made. It may certainly be said to have broken down for, while the man said he had been turned out by reason of his politics, Captain Stewart, who had the best opportunity of knowing what motives had influenced him, said he had been turned out for persistent poaching. And, in fact, as Mr. Allanson proved (*vide supra*) the man had been convicted for poaching. A very determined attack was made upon Mr. H. J. Ellis Nanney in this connection; but it is believed to be safe to say that the alleged cases all had reference to the elections of 1868, that none of them were admitted, and that no corroboration of any one of the suggested political evictions, which were made in the form of written questions from the audience, was offered by anybody. Mr. Nanney, however, by reason, as all who know him are aware, of his anxious care to avoid inaccuracy of statement, made one rather unhappy answer. Asked by Lord Kenyon, "Would you

emphatically say you had never given a notice to quit (for a political reason)?" He answered, "Not to the best of my recollection." On this point he was pressed by the Chairman (Lord Carrington) several times ; but he declined to be more definite, and there is no doubt that an unfavourable impression was produced. But the fact remains that in the case of David Jones, of Bryn Llefrith (as quoted in his evidence), the alleged victim remained in his farm for the next ten or eleven years, and then left it to go to one he had purchased, having been fully compensated for all the improvements he had made on the farm he left. It is common experience that a scrupulously exact witness is apt to be believed less freely than a man who makes bold and comprehensive statements on matters about which he does not really feel certain. Again (11,446) it was suggested that a Mr. William Owen had received notice to quit his holding on the Vaynol estate for political reasons in 1868. As a matter of fact it was admitted by the witness that the reason assigned was a desire to make Mr. Owen's holding a part of the home farm, that it was so used for eleven months, and that the owner of the estate then negotiated an exchange with another tenant. It needs hardly to be added that the agent who gave the original notice was dead, so that he could not explain his motives.

These are poor cases indeed ; but they are among the best, are indeed almost the whole, of the specific cases. Against sorry stuff of this kind, against old tales raked up and exaggerated, against flimsy suggestions of wrong done in recent times, suggestions denied on the spot, and in support of which not a rag of evidence was offered later, it were really unnecessary to make any case. But a case is made, in the evidence ; and those who are patient enough to refer to it will find it *in extenso*. Some of it, however, may be recapitulated with advantage. Here is the testimony of Mr. Price of Rhiwlas :

"Changes on my estate have been less frequent during the last ten years than the previous ten years. From 1873 to 1883 there have been forty-eight changes, whereas from 1883 to 1893 only about thirty cases of removals, an average of three per annum. Thirteen removed to other farms, of whom eight went to bigger ones and some to smaller ones.

"Professor Rhys.

"8170. On the same estate?—On the same estate. Seven gave up farming. I am only giving evidence regarding my own estate.

"8171. But do you mean leaving your estate or moving from one farm on your estate to another farm on your estate?—No; moving from one farm on my estate to a bigger one—better ones. We look upon bigger farms as better ones; perhaps it may not be right.

"Chairman.

"8171a. Will you proceed with your instances?—Seven gave up farming altogether."

The seven proved for the most part to have simply retired. Mr. Price also gave numerous instances in which outgoing or deceased tenants had been succeeded by relatives. The Hon. R. H. Eden, Lord Dudley's agent, said: "Very few changes except from death." Mr. Walter Jones said: "The changes on the estate I have to manage are very rare." This was the common form of the evidence; but occasional witnesses went into significant detail.

Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West spoke thus of the Penrhyn estate:

"12,097. There are about 167 farms which have been held by the same families for 50 years and upwards. In all cases where there are near relations available on the avoidance of

a farm the tenancy is given to them unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary. There are some tenants who claim that their families have been on the Penrhyn estate for upwards of 200 years."

Captain Stewart produced the following remarkable list of hereditary succession in holdings by the same families :

Occupations held under . . .	20 years	44
" 20 years and under . . .	30	" 32
" 30 " . . .	40	" 42
" 40 " . . .	50	" 91
" 50 " . . .	60	" 57
" 60 " . . .	70	" 48
" 70 " . . .	80	" 37
" 80 " . . .	90	" 35
" 90 " . . .	100	" 24
" 100 " . . .	150	" 93
" 150 " . . .	200	" 51
" 200 " . . .	250	" 68
" 250 " . . .	300	" 17
" 300 " . . .	350	" 16
" 350 " . . .	400	" Not known
" 400 " . . .	450	" 4
" 500 and over . . .	.	1
		660

"The number of families in occupation over 50 years is 451 out of the 660 replies that I have received."

Lord Stanley of Alderley gave an exact list which is worth reproducing.

ANGLESEY.

Name.	Tenement.	Parish.	Approximate Number of Years the Tenant and Ancestors have Lived on the Estate.	Remarks.
Davies, Elizabeth	Bottan	Llanfachreth	50 years	Succeeded her husband in 1891.
Evans, John	Cefn rhosydd	Bodedern	80 years	
Griffith, David	Penrhyn gwadebog	Amlwch	Traced back to 1815	
Griffith, John	Datarn Hwriad	Llanbadrig, &c. . . .	30 years	Quillet in another farm.
Griffith, William	Quillet Plasglyn	Llanfwrog		Two houses in lease.
Hughes, Catherine	College	Newborough		
Hughes, Charles	Penrhos and Saraganu	Bodedern	13 years	
Hughes, Evan	Ty Croes	Llechylched	About 50 years	
Hughes, Hugh	Penybryn	Llanfaethlu	5 years	Previous tenant left to take a larger farm.
Hughes, John	Moel Haul	Llanfachreth	6 years	
Hughes, John	Rhosycalch	Llanrhyddlad		
Hughes, Robert	Rhosydd	Bodedern	25 to 30 years	
Hughes, Thomas	Tynygraig	"	About 30 years	
Hughes, William	Caermeirch	"	30 to 40 years	
Hughes, William	Datarn newydd	Llanfaethlu	90 to 100 years	Succeeded his father in 1881.
Jones, David	Rhosddu and Gofynys	"	Upwards of 100 years	W. R. Jones (son of the present tenant), now in business at the Steam Flour Mill, Holyhead.
Jones, David	Tryfil fawr	Llandrygarn	About 70 years	
Jones, David	Bryndu	Llanbadrig	4 years	
Jones, O. Lloyd	Gwredog	Amlwch	Traced back to 1636	Farm recently purchased.

Jones, Elias.	Tyddyn uchaf	Aberffraw	30 to 40 years	Previous tenant left to go to his uncle on another farm.
Jones, Griffith	Tynypwll	Bodedern	6 years	
Jones, Hugh	Gammog	Llanrhyddlad	About 80 years	
Jones, John G.	Fadog Lwyd	Llanfaethlu	About 30 years	Succeeded his father in 1888.
Jones, John	Tynylon	Aberffraw	Traced to 1815	
Jones, John.	Tanybryn	Llanrhyddlad	50 to 60 years	
Jones, Mary	Pont-y-pandy	Llanddeusant	About 65 years	
Jones, Robert, Rev.	Vicarage	Bodewryd		
Jones, Thomas	Glanygors	Llanbadrig	About 40 years	
Jones, Thomas (representative of late)	Plas	Bodewryd	58 years	
Jones, William	Tynygraig	"	12 years	William Jones (son), now farming at Tynygraig.
Lewis, H., Col.	Caia Tyddyn	Llanfihangel T.B.		(Fields situate in Col. H. Lewis's farm.)
Morris, Robert	Rerw Goch	Llanynghenedl	22 years	
Morris, William	Ty Mawr	Llanfairynubwll	44 years	
Owen, Dorothy	Dwygir	Amlwch	6 years	Farm purchased in 1887.
Owen, Elizabeth	Glanygors	Llanfigael	About 80 years	
Owen, E. R.	Bodowyr	Bodedern	21 years	
Owen, Griffith	Glanygors	Llanfihangel yn howyn	6 years	
Owen, J. E. and W. W.	Rhosbeirio	Llanfihangel yn howyn	6 years	Farm purchased in 1887.
Owen, Richard	Ysgubor ddu	Llanfiewyn	60 to 70 years	
Owen, Brothers	Penymynydd	Bodedern	80 to 90 years	
Owen, Elizabeth	Tregwehelydd	Llantrisant	Traced back to 1820	
Owen, William	Tyddyn Pandry	Llanbadrig	Traced back to 1815	
Owen, John	Trefadog	Llanfaethlu	80 to 90 years	
Parry, John	Caermeirch	Bodedern	20 to 30 years	
Parry, John	Yrwr Fawr	Llanynghenedl	50 to 60 years	
Parry, Margaret	Bryn Prydder	Llanfihangel yn howyn	8 years	Farm exchanged in 1885.
Pritchard, Rowland	Maes y wrach	Bodedern	6 years	
Roberts, David	Plas Goronwy	Llanbedrigoch	8 years	Farm purchased in 1885.
Roberts, Hugh	Tynycac	Bodedern	30 to 40 years	
Roberts, John	Hendy	Llanfaethlu	About 30 years	

ANGLESEY—(continued).

Name.	Tenement.	Parish.	Approximate Number of Years the Tenant and Ancestors have Lived on the Estate.	Remarks.
Roberts, Robert .	Tanybryn .	Llanfaethlu	14 years	Got by exchange, vacant. Tenant married daughter of the previous tenant. William Rowlands is a nephew of Griffith Rowlands, the above-named tenant of Tynybuarth. The latter was brought up at this farm.
Roberts, Robert .	Preferwydd .	Llandrygarn	80 to 90 years	
Roberts, William .	Beddyeon .	Llanfachreth	7 years	
Rowlands, Griffith	Tynybuarth .	Aberffraw .	30 to 35 years	
Rowlands, Jane, and William Jones	Fferam dryfol .	"	90 to 100 years	
Rowlands, Owen .	Tyndryfol .	Llanrhyddlad	"	
Rowlands, William	Cammag bach	Llandrygarn	7 years . . .	
	Tynllan .		Over 50 years .	
Rowlands, William	Dalar Hir .	Bodedern .	90 to 100 years .	
Thomas, Rowland	Plas Brain .	Llanbedroch	50 to 60 years	
Thomas, Ellen .	Cac Mawr .	Llanrhyddlad		
Williams, Dorothy	Dronwy .	Llanfachreth	28 years	
Williams, Edward	Bronheulog	Llanddeusant	50 years . . .	
Williams, Elizabeth	Tyddynbont	Gwalchmai	About 50 years	
Williams, Elizabeth	Tyddynrallt	Llanfaethlu		
Williams, Ellen .	Bodorgan .	Bodedern .	15 years .	
Williams, Hugh .	Tynrallt .	Llanbadrig	Traced back to 1840	
Williams, Hugh .	Yr Efail .	Rhosbeirio .	Traced back to 1815	One son is now a doctor in South Wales.

Williams, Hugh .	Penrhyn .	Llanfwrog .	69 years .	Edward Williams (brother to Hugh Williams) is tenant of Bronheulog.
Williams, Jane .	Tybach .	Aberffraw .	Upwards of 80 years .	Richard Williams (brother), now tenant of Tre Hwfa.
Williams, John .	Caegwyn .	Llandrygarn .	About 70 years .	David Williams (brother), now tenant of Fadog Yrreh Llanfaethlu.
Williams, John .	Tai uchaf .	Bodedern .	Traced back to 1815 .	Succeeded his father in 1889.
Williams, John .	Tremolgoch bach .	Llanddeusant .	About 45 years .	Brother (John Williams) now farming at Penrallt, Bryngwran.
Williams, John .	Caerdeon .	" .	Traced back to 1815 .	One son is now a doctor.
Williams, Margaret .	Felin Wen .	Bodewryd .	Traced to 1840 .	Eleazer Williams (brothers), is now farming "Ddrydwy Farm," Ty Croes.
Williams, Richard .	Glanygors .	Bodedern .	50 to 60 years .	Succeeded her husband in 1891.
Williams, Robert .	Cae faly .	" .	80 to 90 years .	
Williams, Robert .	Treangharad .	" .	About 90 years .	
Williams, William .	Maenogoron .	Llantrisant .	About 60 years .	
Williams, William .	Tyddynbach .	" .	Traced to 1840 .	
Williams, William .	Park .	Llandrygarn .	50 to 60 years .	
Williams, Martha .	Penrhyn Newydd .	Amlwch .	Traced to 1815 .	
Williams, O. Rep. .	Caebach .	Llanddeusant .	30 to 40 years .	
Wright, John .	Cerrig cammog .	Llanrhyddlad .	2 years .	
Williams, W., a Doctor .	Brynbodyn .	Llanddeusant .		

PARISH OF HOLYHEAD.

Tenant.	Tenement.	Approximate Number of Years the Tenant and Ancestors have Lived on the Estate.	Remarks.
Edwards, William . Evans, Robert . Flanagan, Cormac . Griffith, William . Griffith, William .	Goferydd . . . Tyddyngeaenor . . . Land Plas Croes, &c. . . Yr Efail . . . Druid House, Tŵr Mill, &c. . .	50 to 60 years . . . 20 years . . . About 50 years . . . 50 years . . .	Traced back to 1851. Thomas Griffith (brother) established in business at Bangor as a grocer, &c, Married daughter of late tenant.
Harper, William . Hughes, John . Hughes, John . Hughes, Margaret . Hughes, Mary .	Trefengan . . . Bryn Luc . . . Yr Efail bach . . . Gorsgoch . . . Tymawr (mountain) . . .	50 years . . . 20 years . . . Over 100 years . . . 45 years . . . About 70 years . . .	Widow of late tenant. Hugh H. Hughes (brother) went to Australia, amassed considerable wealth, and is now living at Holyhead. (Three generations.) (Traced back with rental to 1815.) Owen James (who died in 1892) and his ancestors had been tenants at Turnpike over 80 years. (Three generations.)
Hughes, Robert . Hughes, Susannah . Hughes, Mary .	Gors y Tŵr . . . Mynyddgofdu . . . Turnpike . . .	75 years . . . At least 100 years	
Jones, Catherine and Richard Jones, Owen and Edward Jones, Elizabeth . . . Jones, Elizabeth . . .	Brynau Geirwon . . . Penbryn Creorist . . . Tynceydd . . . Ffynon Gorllas . . .	90 years . . . 45 to 50 years . . . 45 to 50 years . . . About 70 years . . .	Widow of late tenant. John Williams (brother to Mrs. Jones) was a naval engineer. He is now pensioned, and living in Liverpool.

Jones, Ellen	Tanygraig	50 to 60 years	Widow of late tenant.
Jones, Grace	Cerrigylloi	100 years	
Jones, J. W.	Bodwarren	At least 100 years	He succeeded his uncle, Captain Williams. Traced to 1851.
Jones, Owen	Tyntowyn (moiety)	Traced to 1815	J. Jones (brother), farming Llwynon Farm, Llanfair P. G.; William Jones (brother), farming Bodwina, Trewalchmai, all sons of a late tenant.
Jones, Owen	Tymawr		
Jones, Robert	Penrhyn Owen	15 years	(New tenant.)
Jones, Thomas	Tyddyn lantern	20 years	
Jones, William	Porthdafarch	About 50 years	
Lewis, John	Pontysgyrog	About 12 years	
Lewis, Richard	Tynyffrwd	20 years	
Lewis, Sarah J.	Gorswen	34 years	
Morris, Owen	Penybryn	43 years	
Morris, R., Mrs.	Ynysgof	55 years	
Morgan, Mrs., Representatives	Tyddyn Pioden	38 years	Son of late tenant.
Moses, John	Tyddynbach	At least 60 years	(New tenant.)
Noble, William	Caer Bothan	34 years	Succeeded his father.
Owen, Hugh	Llwynyberth	10 years	Succeeded his father.
Owen, John	Dryll	20 years	Purchased from Marquis of Anglesey.
Owen, Richard	Caer Mawr	20 years	
Owen, Thomas G.	Ysguborleiniw	20 years	
Owen, William	Tymynydd	20 years	
Parry, John	Tyddynbach	5 years	Recently purchased from late Thomas Parry; he having purchased about 55 years ago, and occupied the farm himself.
Parry, Mary	Rhosgadar		
Parry, Mary	Hafod y Brain		
Riva, William	10 Stanley Street, and Land	50 years	
Roberts, Ellen	Part of Tyddynbioden	About 50 years	
Roberts, Samuel	Porthdafarch		
Roberts, William	Penybryn	About 40 years	Believed to be about 300 years.

PARISH OF HOLYHEAD—(continued).

Tenant.	Tenement.	Approximate Number of Years the Tenant and Ancestors have Lived on the Estate.	Remarks.
Thomas, John and Anna Thomas, Ellen Thomas, Catherine Williams, Ann Williams, Edward Hugh	Trefnagath Plas Stryd Glantraeth Ty Mawr (Penrhos Feilw).	About 50 years About 20 years About 20 years	Widow of the late tenant. Widow of the late tenant. Widow of the late tenant. Removed from Penybryn, where their family had been for generations. Succeeded their brother at Ty Mawr.
Williams, Jane Williams, John Williams, John Williams, Owen	Tyddyn Uchaf. Twr. Porthtwina Bagnol	50 to 55 years. 30 years 35 years .	Nephew of late tenant. Purchased about 35 years ago. The family have been on the farm for generations.
Williams, O. T., Dr. Williams, R., Captain Williams, Thomas Williams, Thomas Williams, William Williams, William	Rhosygaer Yr Ogof Penybone. Cae fable. Tan Refail Bunwerth	20 years 50 years 30 to 35 years 25 years 35 years Traced to 1815	A brother (Owen Williams) is farming Glan y gors Farm, Llanfaelog.
Williams, William	Stanley Street and Tan alltran	Said to be nearly 300 years	One son (Robert Williams) is a doctor in the Navy. Another son (William S. Williams) established as a butcher in Holyhead. The late Dr. Williams, Dronwy (brother to present tenant), was brought up at Tanalltran.

PARISH OF RHOSCOLYN.

Edwards, Hugh . . .	Pwllpillo . . .	About 80 years .	Two brothers of present tenant were builders at Manchester. Both now dead. Mr. J. Roberts succeeded his father as tenant in 1881. He was until last year traffic manager in the Limerick and Waterford Railway, but has now retired.
Hughes, Elizabeth . . .	Hendy . . .	50 years	
Jones, Hugh . . .	Tynrhos . . .	40 years	
Jones, Richard . . .	Cerrig . . .	50 years	
Owen, John . . .	Rhydbont . . .	Over 100 years.	
Owen, Owen . . .	Blue Bell and Tynrhos . . .	20 years	
Roberts, John . . .	Tynrallt . . .	66 years . . .	
Williams, John . . .	Garreglwyd . . .		

Mr. W. Forrester Addie for Lord Powis was able to give the following schedule of length of holdings on Lord Powis's Montgomeryshire estates:

Years.								No. of Holdings.
1	to	5	.	.	.	.	.	87
5	"	10	.	.	.	.	.	53
10	"	20	.	.	.	.	.	109
20	"	30	.	.	.	.	.	66
30	"	40	.	.	.	.	.	72
40	"	50	.	.	.	.	.	61
50	"	60	.	.	.	.	.	49
60	"	70	.	.	.	.	.	50
70	"	80	.	.	.	.	.	39
80	"	90	.	.	.	.	.	22
90	"	100	.	.	.	.	.	21
100	"	110	.	.	.	.	.	46
110	"	120	.	.	.	.	.	6
120	"	130	.	.	.	.	.	12
130	"	140	.	.	.	.	.	7
140	"	150	.	.	.	.	.	9
150	"	160	.	.	.	.	.	13
160	"	170	.	.	.	.	.	2
170	"	180	.	.	.	.	.	2
180	"	190	.	.	.	.	.	1
190	"	200	.	.	.	.	.	1
200	"	210	.	.	.	.	.	9
210	"	230	.	.	.	.	.	6
230	"	250	.	.	.	.	.	1
250	"	400	.	.	.	.	.	7

751

Very striking also in this relation was the evidence of Colonel H. R. Hughes relating to the Wynnstay estates and others connected with them. It ran thus:

“The custom of continuous family succession in tenancy has always been a predominant feature on this estate, in fact on the Welsh portion it is and has been an invariable rule to accept a member of a deceased tenant’s family as his successor.

“When there is a member of the family eligible to succeed, the preference is given to him or her ungrudgingly, and I cannot record any case where the widow was not allowed to succeed her deceased husband as tenant if she so wished, or failing her, the son or other near relative.

“This continuity of tenancy is more in evidence among the Welsh-speaking tenants, and there are some remarkable instances of farms on this property continuing in the occupation of the same family for very long periods.

“The following are noteworthy instances of continuous family succession, vouchsafed for principally by the present respective occupiers, who take as much pride in their heritage as if they were fee simple owners of their holdings :

“WELSH ESTATES.

“On the Glanllyn estate in the parish of Llanuwchllyn :—

“The Parry and Davies family have been at	
Brynllech	400 years.
“The Jones family at Llwyngwern over .	350 „
“The Williams family at Dwrnudon . .	300 „
“The Edwards family at Drwsynant . .	200 „
“The Jones family at Cefngwyn . . .	150 „
“The Jones family at Wern . . . over	300 „
“The Evans family at Ty Coch	160 „

1860 years.

“Average, $232\frac{1}{2}$ years per family.

“ On the same estate in the parish of Trawsfydd :—

“ The Jones family have been at Bryncelynog 400 years.

“ The Roberts family at Tyddyn Du . over 300 „

“ The Owen family at Tyddyn Mawr . . 300 „

“ Average 333 years per family.

“ On the Llanbrynmair estate there are numerous instances, viz : Llanbrynmair Parish :—

“ The Hughes family have been at Cwmcarn-
edd 300 years.

“ The Roberts family at Hafodwen . . 300 „

“ The Evans family at Coedglyniaen . . 300 „

“ The Jones family at Ystradfawr . . 200 „

“ The Evans family at Clawdd-a-choed . 100 „

“ The Jervis family at Ty-pellaf . over 300 „

“ The Jervis family at Ty-mawr-yn-llan . 100 „

“ And the Lewis family at Ffridd fawr had
recently in their possession rent receipts
going back 272 „

“ Average 234 years per family.

“ In Carno Parish the Breeze family have occupied Glan-
banog for 150 years, and previous to that, lived on the estate
at Cae Twpa, Llanbrynmair.

“ In Trefeglwys Parish :—

“ The Hughes family have been at Rhiw-
feity about 250 years.

“ The Owen family at Llwyn-y-gog about . 250 „

“ The Wigley family at Rhosgoch about . 200 „

“ Average 243 years.

“ In Garthbeibio Parish the Hughes family have lived at
Dolymaen about 250 years, and the Vaughans at Hafody-
beudy and Dolfrynog in Llanerfyl Parish, 300 years, coming
there from the Llwydiarth estate.

“The history of the Llwydiarth estate is of the same unique character:—

“The Jones family have been at Blaenycwm from 150 to 200 years.

“The Williams family at Cammen about 100 years.

“The Jones family at Cammen Fawr from 150 to 200 years.

“The Watkin family at Gwaellod Cammen from 150 to 200 years.

“The Watkin family at Groes from 100 to 150 years.

“The Jones family at Llawrycwm from 150 to 200 years.

“The Evans family at Tyn-y-coed about 200 years.

“The Williams family at Dafarn Newydd about 200 years.

“The Lloyd family at Brynmawr from 150 to 200 years.

“The Davies family at Braichywaen from 150 to 200 years.

“The Evans family at Cefnleisiog from 150 to 200 years.

“The Jones family at Coedleos about 150 years.

“The Rees family at Maesglynne from 300 to 400 years.

“The Jones family at Cuddig from 150 to 200 years.

“The Watkin family at Erw Glanrafon about 100 years.

“The Humphreys family at Fachwen Ganol about 100 years.

“The Watkin family at Fachwen Isaf about 100 years.

“The Jones family at Fronlas from 150 to 200 years.

“The Roberts family at Llwynhir about 150 years.

“The Davies family at Penyrwtra upwards of 200 years.

“The Davies family Lletty Meirch upwards of 200 years.

- “The Jones family at Mynydd-ddwlan Uchaf about 200 years.
- “The Jones family at Melin ddwr about 200 years.
- “The Evans family at Pendugwm about 150 years.
- “The Jones family at Penisa'r Llan about 200 years.
- “The Jones family at Pantglas about 200 years.
- “The Jones family at Tyn y celyn mawr about 200 years.
- “The Parry family at Tyn y maes about 200 years.
- “The Lewis family at Tyn y rhos about 200 years.

“On the Llangedwyn estate there is a long record of continuity of tenancy, the following families have been on their respective farms for generations, none for a period of less than three and many for seven generations:—

- “The Sides family at Pen y bryn.
- “The Morris family at Wernolen,
- “The Thomas family at Highlands.
- “The Vaughan family at the Mount.
- “The Jones family at Penyffridd.
- “The Davies family at Gartheryr.
- “The Davies family at Banhadla.
- “The Jones family at Cilbach,
- “The Hughes family at Tany-gors-goch.
- “The Buckley family at Tynymaes.
- “The Kynaston family at Frongoch.
- “The Mills family at Penyddalfa.
- “The Davies family at Trefeiliw.
- “The Buckley family at Frondeg.
- “The Buckley family at Cefnisa.
- “The Jones family at Cefnllaniwrch.
- “The Vaughan family at Cryniarth.
- “The Lewis family at Trebrys.
- “The Davies family at Tybrith.
- “The Buckley family at Glaniwrch.

- “The Owen family at Yr Aran,
- “The Vaughan family at Yr Aran.
- “The Price family at the Fron.
- “The Morris family at Pentre-gwyn-bach.
- “The Sides family at The Golfa.
- “The Jones family at Pentrecwm.
- “The Lloyd family at Tregeiriog Mill.
- “The Lewis family at Nantyrhiwlas.
- “The Jones family at Blaenrhiwlas.
- “The Williams family at Tynybwllch.
- “The Hughes family at Tynycelyn.
- “The Hughes family at Penyrallt.
- “The Williams family have been at Cli mawr about 200 years.
- “The Evans family at Tan-y-dderwen for 100 years.
- “The Moreton family at Abercynlleth for 150 years.
- “The Morgan family at Rhydgaled for 100 years.
- “The Edwards family at Henblas for about 200 years.
- “The Evans family at Glan Tanat for 300 years.
- “The Edwards family at Caerfach about 200 years.
- “The Williams family at Efel Rhyd Mill about 200 years.
- “The Evans family at Trewern Isaf about 100 years.
- “The Pierce family at Frongoch 100 years.
- “The Jones family at Cwmegar 155 years.
- “The Foulkes family at Penllan 130 years.
- “The Jones family at Pen-y-graig Ucha 152 years.
- “The Jones family at Pentre Geiriog for 200 years.
- “The Hughes family at Pen-y-graig Uchaf for 200 years.
- “The Edwards family are at Sycharth for 400 years, and the Foulkes family are supposed to have occupied Gartheryr for quite 1000 years.

“On the Llanforda Estate :—

“The Thomas family have been at Pantyffynon 200 years.

“The Edwards family at Penybryn 200 years.

“The Evans family at Nant y gollen 200 years.

“The Edwards family at Pentre gaer 200 years.

“The Edwards family at Cynynion 200 years.

“The Jones family at Brongoll 250 years.

“The Davies family at Cleveland, 150 years, and the Roberts family have been at Rhydygroesau for five generations.

“On the Wynnstey estate, there is comparatively little continuity of tenancy to record, as there is but once instance of a family having occupied a farm for more than 100 years.

“Taking the property as a whole, especially of the Welsh estates, I venture to think this proves that where a long succession of *undivided* ownership creates confidence in its long established practice and traditions (which are handed down, with such hereditary appreciation of their value, as on these estates) the system is far better adapted to the economical requirements of the community than any system involving *joint* ownership which can be devised.”

These are samples of the solid and substantial evidence which is offered to show that the allegation of frivolous and capricious evictions, so easy to make in a general form, and so difficult to rebut in that form ; so difficult to make in a definite form, and so exceedingly easy to rebut in that form, is really not worth the paper it is written upon or the breath in which it is uttered. It will be observed that the examples chosen and put forward in evidence most prominently came from the large estates. That course was adopted designedly, not because it would not have been a simple matter to obtain similar evidence from the smaller estates, but simply because it is on the larger estates, otherwise allowed to be well and

generously managed, that capricious evictions are said to have taken place. The evidence cited clearly shows that upon these large estates tenancy is not only secure but virtually hereditary, and the most signal proof and confession of this is to be found in the fact that the party of discontent complained continually that in this case or in that the widow or the niece, or the cousin of a deceased tenant had not been allowed to succeed to the holding as of right. When men allege insecurity of tenure on the mere ground that the landowner, in quite exceptional cases and for good reason assigned, has not followed a practice which has become matter of habit and of grace, although having no foundation in law, and when in refutation plain facts of this kind are brought forward, and none can be proved *per contra*, surely the case of the accusers has perished altogether.

CHAPTER IX.

Sectarian Preference—Evidence of Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P.—a ridiculous Letter—an unauthorised Circular which was not circulated—Absence of Evidence—95 p.c. of tenantry Nonconformists.

Contracts out of Agricultural Holdings Act 1883—not proven—void if made—Contracts out of Custom of Country defended—Copies of Agreements easily to be obtained—Grievances as to “Services” quite unreal—Grievances as to Game, minor—Penal Clauses in Agreements.

Two allegations, dealing with alleged sectarian preferences and alleged contracts out of the Agricultural Holding Act of 1883 and the evidence brought forward in support of them, may be dealt with in this chapter. The first was made in “Adfyfr’s” pamphlet and in Mr. Ellis’s speech in the House of Commons; and expression was given to it, in that vague and indefinite form dear to the Cymric heart, by Mr. Bryn Roberts, M.P., before the Commission at Carnarvon; and Mr. Bryn Roberts’s words may be taken as a typical example of what was said by many witnesses, and denied by many others.

“Great complaint has also been felt—and that is in recent times—with respect to a preference which has been universally believed by the Nonconformists in that neighbourhood to have been given to Churchmen and Conservatives in the case of applications for vacant houses and tenements. I do not think there ever has been any complaint of any Nonconformists being evicted on account of their Nonconformity, nor has there been usually, as far as I am aware (and I do not

think there has been any at all), any complaint of, say, a Nonconformist's son, living at home with his father, assisting him, not being allowed to succeed his Nonconformist father. But complaints have arisen in cases where they say the houses or the tenements naturally become vacant by the death of tenants who had no wives or sons living at home, and therefore the estate authorities had to seek for tenants from among strangers. Chiefly, since the year 1880, principally after the election of that year, the feeling has been universal in that district that it was hopeless for a Nonconformist to apply for a tenement or a house on the Vaynol estate if there was a Churchman competing."

This amounts to a statement that there had been a feeling that preference had been given to Churchmen, as opposed to Nonconformists, when both were applicants for the same tenancy. Now the statement that a rumour or a feeling has existed is, by its very nature, incapable of disproof. The most that can be done is to show that there has been no ground for such a feeling or rumour. This Mr. Bryn Roberts himself did by admitting (13,161) that no such feeling or complaint exists now; and Captain Stewart, the agent of the Vaynol estate, supplemented him by denying emphatically (13,395) that differences in language, creed, or politics affected in any way the relation of landowner and tenant. Moreover, the evidence of Mr. Bryn Roberts throws additional light upon the subject. He explained that the monthly meeting of the Governing Body of the Calvinistic Methodists was a perambulatory body. "When it visits a particular chapel it is the universal custom always to inquire as to the success or otherwise of the cause in that particular chapel." In this particular district the monthly meeting seems to have discovered that Nonconformity was losing ground. Ignoring absolutely the natural explanation of the very slight change in matters of belief which may induce

migration from Calvinistic Methodism to the Church, Mr. Bryn Roberts promptly imputed mean motives to the converts. "Weak people—people of slight principle, were disposed to leave the chapel in the hope that when any chance of advancement came they would have a better opportunity of securing that advancement." But conscientious change of view is the natural explanation, and when account is taken of the unpopularity which a man must risk amongst his former associates upon a change of creed, and of the fact that Mr. Bryn Roberts, who is in the very best position to obtain information, could not or would not give a specific instance in which change of creed had operated to a man's advantage, it is reasonably clear that conscience was, and is, the true spring of action in these changes of creed.

The allegation is, however, one which, by reason of its potent efficacy in stirring up ill-feeling, is a favourite weapon in the hands of the party of agitation, and they left no stone unturned to impress it upon the minds of the Commissioners. Thus, Mr. Bryn Roberts produced this letter, printed in the Conservative *North Wales Chronicle* of May 7th, 1887 (which, by the way, was disclaimed editorially at the time), and Mr. Lloyd George, M.P., referred to the same letter in a question addressed to Lord Penrhyn at Llangefni. Here is the letter:

"It is rumoured that the desirable farm called Hafod (200 acres) in this parish is now vacant. It is to be hoped that Sir Richard Bulkeley will this time give the preference to a Conservative and a thorough Churchman should one apply for the farm, otherwise the Church in the place will suffer considerably. Between emigration on the part of Churchmen, and the filling up of farms in the neighbourhood of late by extreme Radicals and chapel-going people, the Church has suffered considerably. For the past forty years dissent has made its mark; and if due caution is not taken soon, it

will be useless to ring the church bell. The future success of churches to a certain degree, particularly in such a county as Anglesey, depends upon the action of Conservative landlords. They are a power in the country."

But Mr. Bryn Roberts went on to say, in answer to Lord Kenyon:

"I do not think it has ever been a complaint on Sir Richard's estate at all; I think in the past, at any rate, not a single tenant on that estate felt he was under a disadvantage by being a Nonconformist. I only mention it as showing that among a large section of Churchmen that feeling has been very prevalent within the last twenty-five years—I do not think it existed before then, or thirty years at any rate."

Now, as a matter of fact, the letter is, on the face of it, the expression of one man's opinion, and Mr. Bryn Roberts expressly acquitted the landowner to whom it was virtually addressed of having been influenced by it in the slightest degree. But, so far as the latter expresses any opinion worthy of attention, it refers clearly to a belief that farms had been filled up of late with Radicals and Nonconformists and that Churchmanship was the reverse of an advantage to an applicant for a farm. If this was the case (and the rough statistics accessible as to the proportion between Nonconformist and Church tenants go some distance to justify the theory), it would not be by any means contrary to the rules of human experience. There is much human nature in the old story of the schoolmaster who, being accused of favouritism towards his son, administered an exemplary thrashing to him on the spot; and the landowner who chooses a Nonconformist for a tenant may at least be secure from the abuse of the vernacular press for a week or two.

A second wild expedient to which the grievance-mongers were driven was the production of the following circular:

"To the Clergy, Landowners, and Tenants. When the Church and all landed property are so severely and relentlessly attacked, and the spirit of Socialism is so rapidly spreading in the Principality, it has become highly necessary for the clergy and the wealthier among the laity, to know who are their true friends and loyal supporters, and to act accordingly.

"Landowners, in particular, should be on their guard as to the persons to whom they let their land, and should ascertain whether candidates for their farms are the friends of order and justice, or of anarchy and confiscation.

"At the urgent request of several persons of influence, I have opened a Conservative Registry as a medium of communication between landowners wanting tenants, and tenants wanting farms; and with a view of carrying out the suggested scheme, I have to request:

"(1) That incumbents inform me of any farm vacant, or about to become vacant, in their parishes.

"(2) That all Churchmen and Conservatives be made acquainted with the existence of such an office.

"(3) That Conservative landowners and their agents communicate with me whenever a tenant may be required.

"I remain, yours faithfully."

Note that the circular was unsigned and came under notice first when Mr. W. B. C. Jones was under cross-examination at Dolgelley. It had been mentioned in a pamphlet issued by the North Wales Property Defence Association, in terms which left no doubt that its publication had no connection with that body, who, as a fact, at that time believed it to be a forgery and "a regular humbug" (Mr. W. B. C. Jones, 8817), and had discovered it in the columns of the vernacular press. Note also the insinuation contained in a question put by Mr. Brynmor Jones, with a zeal distinctly outrunning discretion.

“8810. It appears in a document printed and published by the North Wales Property Defence Association?—It is printed and published by the North Wales Property Defence Association; but the sentiments are not those of the Association. The expense of the printer’s ink and paper are theirs.”

It is submitted that the question argued the use of anything rather than a judicial mind.

This circular was often referred to again; at last it was run to earth; it was then discovered that a few copies of it had been printed to the order of an irresponsible person at Aberystwith who probably imagined that he could make a living out of the idea. There was no scintilla of evidence that it had affected or interested any human being besides the author, and the ideas embodied in it were repudiated most emphatically by every landowner to whom they were submitted by the Commission.

The two documents that have been quoted appeared as often as a recurring decimal in the evidence of various persons, and the Commissioners were fond of harking back to them. Nor is this matter to be regretted, for it does but serve to show the weakness of the case against landowners. In the face of a mountain of evidence that preference was most distinctly not shown to Churchmen, as compared to a mere molehill to the contrary, the party of agitation was driven to rely upon two documents, issued without authority from any landowner, disavowed by every landowner under whose notice they came, issued anonymously by irresponsible persons, and containing silly advice which nobody followed. Surely evidence of this kind and the frequent use of it is the very best proof that the case was either shockingly ill prepared, or rotten to the core.

The specific allegations made that a preference had been shown for Churchmen were so few in number, so vague, and

so emphatically denied (wherever there was any man alive or accessible to deny them) that they are unworthy of notice. It is impossible to find one that was brought fairly home in the whole of the North Wales evidence. But the real answer to the charge is to be found in the universal admission of the party of agitation that Nonconformist tenants are in overwhelming preponderance—one witness placed it as high as 95 per cent.—for it is idle to talk of preference in the face of such figures as these; in the universal declaration of landowners and agents that the question of creed never entered into their minds in choosing a tenant; in the careful analyses of creeds of tenantry given by such witnesses as Colonel Hughes, and in the long lists of chapel sites given outright, or sold for nominal prices, or let for long terms at nominal rents, handed in on behalf of numerous estates, which will be found in the appendix. In short that accusation has been disposed of for ever; and no truthful person will repeat it in the House of Commons, on the platform, or in the Press.

Let us now pass to quite a different point which may be treated quite shortly. The Commission are now in possession of probably the largest collection of forms of agreement for agricultural tenancy that exists in the world; agreements of which a large number are, naturally enough, since the law of landowner and tenant is identical in England and Wales, in common use in England and Wales. Indeed, the most stringent of them all is, odd as it may seem, a Scotch form, abounding in legal expressions not intelligible to English lawyers. The indictment against these agreements may be stated with the particular answer to each count on the spot; the general answer to it shall follow.

The following are the accusations made against the framers of these agreements:

(1) It is said that, to quote Mr. Ellis in the House of Commons, "You could count on the fingers of one hand the

number of landlords who did not contract themselves out of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875."

The statement as it stands would doubtless be admitted by Mr. Ellis to be somewhat wildly figurative; and he would certainly be compelled to confess that he did not possess the information which would enable him to make it with precision. But the real answer is that inasmuch as "contracting out" was expressly allowed by the Act itself, everybody had a perfect right to avoid it if he chose. The matter would not be worthy of mention but for the growth of a very modern and unsound theory that there is some kind of new immorality in the avoidance of the operation of an Act of Parliament. Judges have often pointed out that the phrase is inaccurate and misleading. An instrument, for example, either comes under the Bills of Sales Acts, or is exempt from them. If it comes under them, it is either a bad or a good Bill of Sale; if it is exempt from them it is simply not a Bill of Sale at all, and not by any means an evasion of the Act. So, when Parliament enacted the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875, with a "contracting out" clause, it left free choice in the matter, and to adopt the Act did not become an action of a virtuous character any more than to put it aside became a vicious proceeding.

(2) It is said that landowners so frame their agreements of tenancy as to contract out of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883. This is a more serious matter because, except as to length of notice, or as to an agreement for a scale of compensation at least equal to and to be substituted for that contained in the Act, the statute is universally obligatory and not optional. Mr. Ellis did not venture to make in the House of Commons an allegation that agreements purported to contract out of this Act. He merely said, with characteristic readiness to impute mean motive, "the pitfalls of the Act were such that one landowner and one agent after another managed to make that Act of no avail in the

majority of cases." This is really rather a childish observation. The object of Parliament was to provide machinery for settling, and enforcing upon landowner and tenant, the respective rights of both parties on the determination of the tenancy. That object was, it is urged by representatives of both parties, far from being attained. Still, there is the law. Neither landowner nor agent, therefore, could take any advantage which was not given in so many words to him by Parliament. And, as for the matter of pitfalls, the Act is, by comparison with other Acts, not particularly noteworthy for them. It is, indeed, unreasonable to attack landowners or agents, *who cannot move under the Statute until a claim is made by the outgoing tenant against them*, because, when such claim is made, they follow the directions of a statute passed by a Government hostile to the landowning interest and based upon the principle that landowners are not to be trusted to make fair contracts. There is no purpose, at this point, of defending the Act, which is indeed imperfect from many points of view, as will be shown presently: the object is rather to show that landowners cannot be blamed justly if they allow their conduct at a given juncture to be regulated by an obligatory statute formulated with the express intention of regulating their conduct at that juncture.

This, however, is not what Mr. Ellis and others complain about. They become indignant about what they call "technicalities"—so do many persons when the so-called "technicalities" do not happen to favour their side; but what they really mean is that wasteful tenants get no advantage in money out of the Act, when a tenancy determines, because the making of a claim by them for the benefit, real or imaginary, which they have conferred upon the land, opens the door for a counterclaim by the landowner in respect of the damage they have done. They may rest assured that Parliament has not yet reached a frame of mind in which this principle will fail to receive the respect which has always been

paid to it since ideas of fair and even justice began to dawn upon the human mind.

But in evidence the accusers went farther than Mr. Ellis had gone. Thus, Mr. David Owen (20,006), a solicitor, who knows very well what the value of an oral statement as to a written document is, said, "I know of agreements where both the custom and the Agricultural Holdings Act have been excluded." He was, however, forced by Lord Kenyon to read a portion of an agreement between Mr. O. Hughes, of Nanner (a small landowner), and Mr. E. Jones, tenant of a holding of 239 acres, which appeared to bear out his contention; but it appeared (20,056) that this document was not the original agreement, but a copy handed to the witness by the tenant. Now, copies are of very little value in cases of this kind. And this was Mr. Owen's ewe lamb—all he had to quote—a mere hand-made copy. Let us assume, however, that in this case, and perhaps in two or three others, it was shown that the written agreement of tenancy did either through ignorance on the part of the draftsman, or designedly, purport to exclude the statute which by law cannot be excluded, remembering always that phrases purporting to exclude the Act are sometimes used, erroneously, with reference to a substituted scale of compensation, which is the vital part of the Act. Supposing, even, that a landowner tries to exclude the whole Act, and tries to do so deliberately. What happens? He turns the whole instrument of tenancy into a piece of waste paper; no harm is done to anybody as long as the tenancy endures; and when the tenancy comes to an end, if he is like ninety-nine Welshmen out of a hundred, the tenant goes to his lawyer, who laughs at the whole business, and recovers for him precisely the amount of compensation under the Act which he would have obtained if the clause purporting to avoid the Act had not been inserted.

The strong man who can digest some four or five thousand large Blue-book pages of evidence, exclusive of the report,

will find scores of general allegations of contracting out of the Act of 1883; but two or three is a generous number to allow (for the whole of Wales) as having been thoroughly brought home. The rest resolve themselves into cases where the twelve months' notice is reduced to six, by mutual agreement and for mutual convenience, or to assertions unsupported by any documentary evidence, and therefore without value, or to undated copies of alleged agreements (which are doubly valueless), or to cases of substituted scale of compensation. Now, avoidance of the notice clause and a substituted scale of compensation are permitted by the Act, and to them it is impossible to offer even a Pharisaical objection.

(3) It is said that landowners contract out of the custom of the country.

The answer is "Yes, frequently," except in Glamorganshire, and the reason for the rule, and the exception, and the justification of both, are near to seek. They are these. You may have compensation by custom, or compensation under the Act; but you cannot have both, because they are sure to overlap one another. Compensation by custom is certainly the preferable method, for custom may be depended upon to advance with the needs of the times far more rapidly and steadily than the law can be amended in a House of Commons subject to unforeseen vicissitudes. The Glamorganshire custom had made this advance, before the Act was passed, and the result is that the Act is a dead letter, to the great delight of all persons concerned. Nobody takes any notice of it, and nobody wishes to take notice of it. Elsewhere, custom being less advanced, the Act, by going a long way to destroy freedom of contract, has entirely stopped the development of those beneficial customs which grew out of contract. But that the tenant cannot have both is as clear in the case of North Wales, where the Act is operative, as in that of Glamorganshire, where the custom has caused it to be

as though it had never been written. Such is the answer to this trifling allegation.

(4) It is said that tenants cannot obtain, free of charge, copies of their agreements; that they do not understand them because they are not in Welsh; and that they sign them in blind ignorance of their contents.

The evidence goes a long way to disprove the first clause in this count, and to show that tenants will hardly accept the copies when offered. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it was proved that copies were both given and explained, where necessary. Certainly there is no case on a considerable estate in which the tenant cannot see his agreement at the agent's office whenever he likes; and equally certainly, the suggestion that any Welshman ever signed a document without understanding it, will be discredited scornfully by any man who knows the country and its people. For the rest, the day when documents of contract are compelled to be in the Welsh language will be the dawn of the resuscitation of the rather languid North Wales circuit. In fact, there is no substance in this part of the complaint, and no more words need be wasted on it.

(5) It is said that the agreements impose irksome services on the tenants, which services are a relic of feudal times and tokens of tyranny, together with other nonsense.

These services, according to the evidence, consist of three things. First, on some estates the agreement ordains that the tenant shall provide the landowner with a fat goose at Christmas. The agreement is never enforced, is not often fulfilled, and, where it is fulfilled, it is as a pure matter of friendship.

Secondly, agreements sometimes provide that coal shall be carted, so many loads as the case may be, by the tenant for the landowner. This clause is sometimes enforced; but, as Mr. Walter Jones pointed out, it is naturally taken into account in fixing the rent.

Thirdly, tenants agree, and are sometimes asked, to maintain foxhound or harrier puppies sent out to walk, as is customary in England. No doubt it is true (see Mr. Seeborn's *Tribal Wales*) that the old Welsh kings and princes had similar but much larger and more important rights. The practice may be an interesting survival; but there is no evidence that anybody makes any objection to it, and certainly no M.F.H. would, in his own interests, force his puppies on an unwilling farmer.

It is only too plain that these allegations of grievances are the creation of grievance-mongers; that they are not felt and are unreal; that they are the proofs of the desperate straits to which the party of discontent has been driven.

It may be amusing, while the subject of dogs is uppermost, to note that in Anglesey a complaint was made that Lord Stanley of Alderley has a habit of shooting stray dogs. There is no denying it; his lordship admits it, and gaily professes his willingness to take the consequences. "I have constantly peppered dogs at a distance," he said. In fact, his lordship has the honour of having furnished the material for a leading case in the law relating to dog-shooting. However, this is not merely a Cymric, but also a Cheshire grievance; and it was a Cheshire woman who had the law of him in respect of "so very unladylike a dog that I did not believe it was hers."

(6) It is said that agreements compel tenants to lend their names for the prosecution of poachers.

This is in some measure true. There is no grievance, because the poaching fraternity know very well who the real prosecutor is. The writer, however, does not believe that the inclusion of this clause in agreements is necessary in law. Certainly, when opposed by shrewd lawyers, he has got convictions without it.

(7) Finally, it is said that the penal clauses in agreements are too severe—clauses prohibiting the breaking up of old

pastures, and so forth—and that the restrictions as to cultivation are so strict as to hamper cultivation.

The subject is one of some difficulty, and that not merely at first sight. True, it is universally admitted by farmer witnesses, and protested by landowners and agents, that good tenants are, as a matter of practice (and know themselves to be) absolutely free to farm at their discretion; and that the restrictions are, so far as they are concerned, absolutely nugatory. But, hard-working, honest, and careful as the majority of Welsh tenants are, the flock is not entirely white; and there are certainly a very large number of gentlemen, whose experience gives their words weight, who hold that the penal and restrictive clauses, of the enforcement of which there is believed to be no evidence, and of the neglect to enforce which there is abundant proof, have a certain value for those who have to deal with bad tenants. Even in Wales there is such a thing as “farming to leave,” and that particular form of vice is not one to be encouraged.

CHAPTER X.

Game Grievances—a silly Story—the Preferential Claim—Arguments for and against—Abolition involves a “Forehand Rent”—Enclosures of Commons and Crown Wastes—purely Legal Questions on which Landowners declined to give Evidence—the Case of Squatters—the Evidence of Mr. Salt—Concerning the Raising of Rent—no Evidence taken of Development of Country and Markets—Vagueness of Idea of Tenant’s Moral Rights in the Way of Compensation—Lord Carrington’s former estate in Cardiganshire—Weakness of Allegations that no Compensation had been paid—Important Evidence of Expenditure in Improvements on many estates—full Statistics.

IN this chapter it is proposed to deal, first, with allegations of grievance connected more or less closely with the preservation of game; secondly, with the evidence relating to the preferential claim; thirdly, with the question of enclosure of commons, and fourthly, with the allegation that rents have been raised on tenants’ improvements. The first three points may be dealt with very briefly; the last will be the main subject of the chapter since it brings in, as of necessity, the survey of the vast mass of evidence placed before the Commission with regard to the investment of capital by landowners in their estates, and the consideration from a rational point of view of the principles which ought to regulate the law of compensation to tenant and landowner in England and Wales from a rational point of view.

The “great Game Question” is one of those subjects upon which the agitator can enlarge with vigorous eloquence on a platform when addressing a mob; it is a topic upon which Radical newspapers, particularly those which represent the

proceedings at a "hot corner" as the mechanical massacre of the innocents, can easily indite furious articles. But when the necessity for proof came in North Wales the agitators were placed in some difficulty. They alleged on occasion, no doubt, excessive preservation of game; but the few statistics which were available showed conclusively to those of the Commissioners who knew what the English standard of first-rate shooting was (Lords Carrington and Kenyon, and Sir John Llewelyn for example), that no really heavy head of pheasants is kept up even round the greatest mansions. It is not intended here to convey the impression that sport in North Wales is not good; but it is certainly the case that in that part of the Principality gentlemen are contented with bags which would be reckoned small in England, and the writer ventures to guess, with some confidence, that the number of pheasants reared and brought to the gun in the County of Norfolk alone in any one year is quite double that of those which suffer the like fate in the whole of North Wales. Concerning hares no grievance was alleged; it was stated repeatedly and not seriously contested, that hares are all but extinct in the country at large, although, of course, there are some in the parks of noblemen and gentlemen. Of partridges nobody complains, and of the alleged grievance concerning grouse—viz., that in their interests the proper burning of the heather was interfered with, was disposed of by Lord Kenyon in a couple of shrewd questions. Let us endeavour then to classify the grievances under their headings:—

Game Laws.—A certain number of witnesses, few if any of whom were farmers, raised the old cry that the Game Laws ought to be abolished. Among the farmers, however, there were a large number who had not the slightest objection to winged game, who acknowledged the benefit which the Game Laws conferred upon them in the way of keeping off trespassers, and expressed the pleasure which they felt in seeing

the landowner and his friends shooting over their holdings. Others, however, not a large number, expressed the opinion that the game ought to be the property of the tenant.

They omitted to reflect that, in the absence of a reservation to the lessor, the game is already the tenant's for which the landowner pays, indirectly, by taking so much less rent than he would take if the reservation were not made. Some also, notably in the Vale of Clwyd, objected to the practice of letting shooting to strangers. For their instruction Mr. T. A. Wynne Edwards produced at Denbigh some valuable statistics showing the pecuniary benefit which accrues to a district from shooting tenants, particularly those who make the said district their home.

It may, however, be said generally and without fear of contradiction, that the grievances on the head of the Game Laws generally were urged seldom, and in a factious rather than a serious spirit.

Beaters.—It was with some amazement that persons familiar with Wales saw in the official syllabus two questions of which the first suggested that tenants were compelled to act as beaters, while the second insinuated that beaters were not paid for their services. The questions were either very ignorant or very malicious. To the suggestion contained in the first of them no particle of evidence gave any support; although, of course, it is true that the tenant of his own free will does often accompany the shooting party over his holding, and would be much insulted if payment were offered. The second suggestion was absolutely disproved everywhere. It would be interesting to learn from what fertile brain these suggestions of a purely imaginary grievance emanated.

Ground Game Act.—It was said that the Act was a dead letter since the tenants dared not avail themselves of it. This general statement was valueless, and specific evidence of its truth was never forthcoming. Of the desperate efforts

to prove this, the history of the evidence of Mr. John Roberts is an amusing instance. He said (9718):

“Although I have a right to the rabbits, yet I fear the consequence of making use of my rights. I have arranged with a man to catch the rabbits on a certain portion of my farm, but in the meantime Lord Harlech’s keepers appeared, and commenced ferreting wholesale. When I remonstrated, I received a threatening letter from Lord Harlech, intimating that if I interfered with them he would see my landlord about it.”

Note first that the two initial sentences flatly contradict one another. On the following day Mr. Roberts came forward again saying that Mr. Lawford, Lord Harlech’s agent, had offered him £1 a year for the privilege of shooting the rabbits (9986), a proceeding alleged by Mr. Brynmor Jones to have been “unlawful under the Ground Game Act.” This was an inaccurate expression for, even assuming that a sale by a tenant of his rights under the Ground Game Act to a person other than his landlord is a void contract—a very doubtful assumption—there is nothing *unlawful* or objectionable in such a sale and purchase. Then Mr. Roberts (9994) produced the following letter from Lord Harlech which, seeing the word “illegal” referred solely to the treatment of two keepers by Mr. Roberts, was distinctly not threatening but the reverse:

“Brogyntyn, Oswestry,
“October 5th, 1892.

“SIR,—I have had a report from my keeper, Edwards, as well as that from you respecting the occurrence on the race-course last Monday. You seem to be quite ignorant of the law as to a tenant’s rights to ground game, and your behaviour was extremely illegal, and you rendered yourself

liable to punishment. However, I am quite disposed to believe your conduct was through ignorance of the law. I exercise my rights to the game and rabbits there from Mr. Pope, who derives his right from your landlord, Mr. Poole. Your best course will be to see Mr. Pope at Hafod-y-bryn, who, being not only a sportsman but a lawyer, will be able to inform you what a tenant's rights respecting ground game are, and if you stick to them there will be no occasion for difference between you and me. The sooner you see Mr. Pope the better.

“Yours faithfully,

“HARLECH.

“To Mr. John Roberts,

“Cefntrefnfawr.”

Then Mr. Lawford came forward to say that Lord Harlech claimed no more than a concurrent right to the rabbits and that Mr. Roberts harboured them, to the damage of Lord Harlech's adjoining property, in order that he might let the shooting. (Why it is right in a tenant to let shooting to one man and wrong for him to let it to another, it is not easy to see.) Then Mr. Roberts came forward (10,004) to say that he claimed an exclusive right, that Mr. Lawford had never paid the £1 and that Mr. Lawford had no cause for complaining of his harbouring rabbits since “there were no rabbits there.” Yet he had said (9718): “I should not complain so much if Lord Harlech simply walked over my farm for sporting purposes, but he catches the rabbits in cart-loads and sends them away to supply the English markets, thus making profit on what I consider my own. I would as soon see him taking away a flock of my sheep and selling them to a butcher.” The Commissioners asked him no questions as to this flat and obvious contradiction. Finally, at a later sitting, Mr. Lawford came forward and, impressed no doubt by the new doctrine, enunciated by Lord

Carrington and Mr. Brynmor Jones, that it is "unlawful" to enter into a void contract, said he might have been wrong in what he did—there was of course absolutely no moral obliquity in his action—and *produced the receipt for £1 from Mr. Roberts.*

A pretty petty story, it will be said, but, apart from the errors and contradictions of his own evidence into which Mr. Roberts fell, themselves illustrative of the kind of evidence on which serious allegations are based, it shows precisely the amount of misunderstanding that exists concerning the Ground Game Act. The Act, in truth, is in active operation all over Wales; but the malcontents claim more than it gives them; they demand an exclusive right to the rabbits, and a right to set traps where they please. At the same time (62,604 and thereabouts) a long dispute between Mr. Vaughan, a tenant farmer, and Mr. W. D. W. Griffiths of Garn, clearly shows that they are only too ready to demand also, and quite inconsistently, compensation for damage done by rabbits which they will not permit the landlord or shooting tenant and their keepers to destroy. They desire, in fact, to eat the whole cake and keep it; and that is an impossibility.

Compensation for Damage done by Game.—A great quantity of evidence, far too long to be recapitulated here, was adduced on this point. In the great majority of cases it reduced itself to an assertion that the compensation given had been inadequate. That is to say, men asked for more than they expected to get, and got less than they asked, and were indignant accordingly. Much evidence of compensation given was adduced; but the question whether it was sufficient or insufficient is one on which opinions naturally differed. It may be pointed out, however, that the ordinary law provides a remedy for damage resulting from the preservation of an excessive head of game. The best example, perhaps, of a monstrously excessive claim was that of a man who claimed a

large sum, £50 or £80 it is believed, for damage done to a field of five or six acres by game, and finally defined the said game as *wild ducks*!

Let us pass to the question of the preferential claim for rent, a question common to England and Wales, concerning which a large volume of evidence has also been given before the Royal Commission on Agricultural Depression, of which Mr. Shaw Lefevre is, or was, chairman. It would be erroneous to say that the questions administered by the Commissioners generally showed any strong feeling on the matter. For our part, we defend the system in the interest of the tenant on various grounds, and are unable to perceive that it works any serious mischief to creditors other than the landowner, and maintain that its abolition would place the tenantry of the country face to face with a serious difficulty. The complaint against it is raised principally by tradesmen who feel some natural annoyance when, upon the failure of a farmer, twelve months' rent (if due) must be paid out of his assets before their claims are considered. The manure-merchant, corn-merchant, and others, however, are in the first place perfectly well aware of the existence of the preferential claim when they give credit to a farmer; and they cannot plead that they are compelled to give credit. *Contra*, the landowner is virtually compelled to allow the tenant the use of his land on credit from day to day for a period, be it three months, six, or twelve, before his rent becomes due. Again, the preferential claim enables the landowner to fix the rent audits, which are suited to the convenience of his tenants, at dates, as the evidence shows abundantly, considerably later than those at which the rent is due. Further, as several agents showed, the existence of the system has frequently enabled landowners to give a helping hand to a farmer in difficulties, thus enabling him to have the benefit of breathing time, which has saved him from utter collapse and the necessity of beginning the world over again. In the absence of such a system it would be necessary, at the very least, for rent

audits to be held on the days when the rent was due ; and, as may be judged from the evidence of Mr. Henry Curr, who was Lord Ancaster's agent, a worse thing might befall the tenantry. The law of hypothec, which comes to much the same thing as the preferential claim, was abolished in Scotland at the request, to a great extent, of the tenant farmers. They wish now that they had never proffered any such request, inasmuch as, said Mr. Curr, in a dry way, "landowners now require a forehand rent." Since human nature varies but little, it may be assumed, with some justice, that landowners in Wales—and in England, too—for the question is not a whit more Welsh than English—would, under like circumstances, follow the example of their Scottish brethren. The inconvenience to farmers would be manifest, for few things could be more awkward than to be called upon to pay six months' rent in advance on entering upon a tenancy, when there are numerous other expenses to meet. One argument in favour of the abolition of the system, that of unfairness to other creditors, has been dealt with already ; the other, often exhibited in an interrogative form by Mr. Richard Jones, was that the security conferred upon landowners by the system was an inducement to them to accept impecunious tenants recklessly. Even from the point of view of those who are disposed to reckon the morality of landowners at the lowest point, the argument was not intelligent ; for Mr. Richard Jones must know very well that an impecunious tenant is an evil to be avoided at any cost.

Into the assertions of alleged wrongful enclosure of commons or Crown waste, which were made with some freedom, it is not proposed to enter here, for the simple reason that the answers to them were not for the most part given in any detail before the Commissioners. Each one of the enclosures stood upon its own merits, and depended upon its own particular set of circumstances, and each one of them necessarily involved a question of title which, in most cases, could not have been threshed

out without considerable expense. Nor were the witnesses who appeared before the Commission equipped, any more than eight out of the nine Commissioners, with that special knowledge which could enable them to speak with authority, and without great risk, on questions of title. Landowners were, therefore, advised not to offer evidence to the Commissioners, or to answer questions upon questions of this character, on the ground that such topics were clearly foreign to the scope of the Commission's inquiry, and that the constitution of the Commission was not such as to justify the belief that it had been intended to spend its energies in that direction. It should be added that the whole of the positive evidence on the other side was of the vaguest character, and that the word "common," as used in Wales, signifies virtually any uninclosed waste, or anything that may ever have been uninclosed waste. Any really illegal enclosure can of course be done away with at the suit of persons aggrieved.

As to "squatters" the case is slightly different. It must, for all practical purposes, be admitted that early in this century, or before, it was not unusual for squatters to build huts and make small enclosures on crown or manorial wastes, and occupy them for some time at any rate, free of rent. They were of course trespassers and wrongdoers from the beginning, but they had some excuse in a tradition that the man who could erect what was called "Caban-un-nos"—that is to say, could build between sunset and sunrise a hut sufficiently substantial for smoke to rise through the chimney—acquired a title. The most part of these little dwellings were built in inaccessible and remote places, where they were apt to escape notice. When they came under notice it became necessary, lest the lord of the manor should lose his title, to obtain acknowledgments for them, and in after years, some of these acknowledgments became tangible rents. In almost every case, however, on the estates of Sir Watkin Wynn and Lord Powis, with regard to

which these accusations were made principally, the increase of rent was accompanied by a corresponding advantage in that the lord of the manor took over the duty of repairs in whole or part (see Mr. Forrester Addie's evidence, 71,594, where numerous cases were given in rebuttal of previous statements). We venture to say that squatters on Crown wastes have not fared nearly so well as those on manorial wastes, and that the whole question is dealt with in sensible fashion in the evidence of Mr. Moultrie Salt. That evidence, *mutatis nominibus*, will apply to every case of alleged illegal inclosure or harsh treatment of a squatter. Mr. Salt, be it observed, is a solicitor of experience and position.

"71,599. You are a solicitor practising at Shrewsbury?—
Yes.

"71,600. Will you give us your evidence?—I have been a solicitor practising in Shrewsbury for 47 years. Up to the year 1864 my father was family solicitor and auditor of the late Earl of Powis, and since that time I have acted in the same capacities with reference to the Montgomeryshire and Shropshire estates of the late and present earls. I have attended the meetings of the Welsh Land Commission at Welshpool, Llanfyllin, and Llanfair, and heard the evidence adduced there. "It has been stated by some of the witnesses that the late Earl of Powis had enclosed portions of the commons or waste lands within his manors and added them to his farms. I do not believe this, and from my knowledge and experience of the affairs I am bound to deny it. He has never to my knowledge, nor have his agents, enclosed any common land. It has also been stated that in several instances his agents have in his name demanded rent from squatters who have enclosed parts of the common lands and built there. This is perfectly correct, and, I believe, was in perfect accordance with his legal rights as lord of the manor. The soil of a manor is unquestionably by law vested in the lord, subject to

the existing rights of persons having rights of common there. A squatter is simply a trespasser, who appropriates and builds on land belonging to other people with the intention of acquiring by lapse of time a right, and thus robbing the rightful owners of their property. The only modes of defeating this object are, either to require the trespasser to attorn and pay rent, or to pull down his buildings and fences and throw the land again open to the common. If the encroachment interferes with the rights of commoners, they can require the latter course to be taken; if not, the lord is quite justified in taking the attornment and receiving the rent, as subject to the commoners' rights he is the owner of the soil.

"The custom of Lord Powis's estate has been to continue the trespasser in possession for his life, and afterwards (unless there are reasons to the contrary) to give members of his family the preference in continuing the tenancy, and in several cases leases for lives have been granted. The rents taken have been small, in many cases merely nominal. In many instances the tenants have let their buildings fall into a ruinous state, so that they have become unfit for habitation and not worth the expense of restoring. In such cases it has been the custom to let the land to the tenant of an adjoining farm, and this is the main reason for the 'consolidation' about which so much has been said.

"I have ventured to make the foregoing observations, because throughout this inquiry I have noticed that while the conduct of the lord of the manor in taking the necessary steps for preserving his rights has been dwelt upon as arbitrary and harsh, no allusion has, as a rule, been made to the utter illegality of the act of the squatter in appropriating that to which he had no claim whatever, and which act was the cause of the interference of the lord of the manor.

"I may also point out that in a county like Montgomeryshire, where the unenclosed lands are so extensive and in

some parts so wild and thinly populated, it is very difficult to obtain information in all cases of encroachment, and therefore the more necessary to deal at once with the cases which come under the notice of the agents of the lord of the manor."

The fact is that the squatter's case rests on the assumption that the man who steals land cleverly ought to be allowed to keep it.

We now reach the far more important question whether rents have been raised in any considerable number of cases wholly or partly upon tenant's improvements. By way of preliminary it is desired to point out that the Commissioners never made any inquiry into those circumstances, other than tenant's improvements, which undoubtedly tend to increase the hiring value of property. Immense sums, as Mr. Wynne of Peniarth proved amongst others, have been spent on main drainage. They have no evidence before them to show, and it is not at all likely that any of them (except perhaps Lord Kenyon) know, when the London and North-Western Railway, or the connection between it and the Great Western from Rhyl to Corwen, was laid down, when Carnarvon was connected with Bangor, when the lines from Carnarvon to Afon Wen and from thence to Pwllheli on the one side, to Portmadoc, Criccieth, Barmouth, Dolgelley, Towyn and so forth were built. They do not know the history of the Anglesey Central line, or the narrow gauge railways, or the connection between Bettws-y-coed and Llandudno Junction. Many of these great changes have been made in the writer's memory during a life of thirty-eight years, and the effects, in the way of opening new markets and bringing down hordes of tourists all anxious for country produce, have been remarkable. Within the last thirty years a great aggregation of houses has sprung up, where formerly there were none, at Colwyn Bay ; Llanfair-

fechan has grown from a village into a large community; Penmaenmawr and Bettws-y-coed have done much the same; Bangor has increased greatly; watering-places have grown up in Anglesey; Criccieth has become a town instead of a village; Barmouth and Dolgelley have increased amazingly. The list might be continued; but it is enough to say that concerning all these developments, the part which landowners played in them, and their effects in opening markets for the rural population and enabling them to dispose of their produce, the Commissioners, having now been in office three years, have not asked a single question, and have no evidence before them. It is therefore of no small importance that it should be borne constantly in mind that every single allegation of rent raised upon tenant's improvements, was made upon the assumption that no other circumstance, other than improvement by landowner or tenant, could by any possibility explain the raising of a rent. It was an unscientific assumption, but still there it is; it underlies the whole of the evidence.

Now to go through the whole of the allegations that rent has been raised from time to time on tenant's improvements, or that, on the termination of a tenancy, the compensation received for tenant's improvements has been inadequate, to show how many of these allegations have been rebutted in the whole or in part, how many of them referred to times long past (so that evidence of what the landowner had done, or had not done, was to all practical purposes unattainable), would be impossible unless another volume at least as long as this one were to be written. Suffice it to say that where the allegations made affected the estates of which the owners and representatives, with rare devotion of service and great patience of tedious evidence, attended the sittings of the Commission, rebuttal, either partial or entire, was made in an astonishing number of cases. Of course it was not possible to prove in each, or perhaps in any case, that the man

who claimed compensation had received precisely the amount for which he had asked. The fallacy that whether improvements be exhausted or unexhausted, or whether alterations be worth the money spent upon them or not, the tenant is entitled on going out to recover every penny he has spent, is apparently of wide prevalence. Still it was possible to prove in scores and hundreds of cases that a tenant, who was alleged to have received no compensation at all, had, as a plain matter of fact, received all the compensation to which the law, which in these days professes to regulate compensation for agricultural improvements, had entitled him. Often, indeed, he was proved to have received more. It may be said, and it was said often, that the Law of Compensation under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 is defective. So it is, from the point of view of both landowner and tenant: so the Law was before the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 was passed. But so long as there is a law of compensation it is surely rather hypercritical to censure men for abiding by it, albeit it were easy to show that many Welsh landowners have gone far beyond it.

Besides, Welsh landowners have the example of the noble chairman of the Commission to encourage them. It was alleged against him, by an enterprising witness in South Wales, that on succeeding to his Cardiganshire estate he sold the property, and that, so selling, he virtually confiscated the improvements which an old miller had made upon a mill situated on the property. The evidence was flowery in style, and was given by an entire stranger to the quarrel, if quarrel there ever was; but neither of these features of the evidence was unusual, in fact both were normal. What was abnormal was that the person alleged to be aggrieved was present at the side of the witness. He had been brought from a workhouse—and in candour it must be added that the poor old man had not the slightest idea what was going on, and that nothing like sense was extorted from him—a circumstance which no

doubt would have added to the pathos of the situation if Lord Carrington had not been the Radical chairman of the Commission. For, under other circumstances, the usual style of agitator witness would probably have said, "the hardships which this poor old man, an orphan and a widower" (neither of these last-named misfortunes is unusual at fourscore years of age, but that is immaterial to an agitator), "has endured have not only compelled him to seek refuge in the workhouse, but also deprived him of his intellect." Now Lord Carrington took the trouble to rebut this story through the mouth of his agent, Mr. Jonas, who looked like an Englishman, and came from Cambridge. Mr. Jonas proved that in 1859 (the date of the preceding letter in which assistance was asked is clearly wrong in the official evidence), permission was given the miller to put in an additional stone, and that, on the sale in 1868, an application was made for compensation and refused on the ground that the local agent considered that the miller had no claim as the improvement had been made so many years (only nine years after all), and the man had been repaid in this manner for his outlay. Here then we have permission asked, so that the improvement was not made without the landlord's knowledge, compensation refused, and the improvement left upon the property. This Mr. Brynmor Jones sought to excuse (70,936) on the ground that the old man might have taken the stone away as industrial plant and machinery. But he did nothing of the kind. He left them, and Lord Carrington sold the mill, stones and all, with the rest of the property. The agent did not think the property sold for a halfpenny more by reason of the stones in the mill. But he could hardly tell for certain, and to the plain man it may seem that a mill fully equipped with stones would be likely to sell for more, even as part of a large property, than an unequipped mill. Finally, in answer to the following questions, Lord Carrington's agent was compelled to admit that Lord Carrington was, as to a

transaction of 1868, in really much the same position as other landowners.

“ Lord Kenyon.

“70,943. Then Mr. Vincent asks: ‘Do you deny that the mill-stones were left behind?’—Certainly not; they were left behind as tenants’ fixtures.

“70,944. ‘Do you deny that the miller received no compensation directly from Lord Carrington?’—The miller received no compensation other than the late Lord Carrington bearing part of the expense, that is to say, finding the timber.

“ Mr. Brynmor Jones.

“70,945. I do not understand that any application was ever made for compensation in this case?—Yes, there was; there was a distinct application made at the time when the tenant left.

“ Mr. Brynmor Jones.

“70,947. Why did he not take away the stones then?—That I cannot say.

“ Lord Kenyon.

“70,948. Then Mr. Vincent asks: ‘Then do you deny that Lord Carrington did benefit from the miller’s work although the miller had the enjoyment of the stones long enough to repay him?’—Certainly the *late* Lord Carrington benefited in no way whatever from the miller’s work, either directly or indirectly.

“70,949. Not at the sale of the property?—Neither at the sale of the property or otherwise.

“70,950. The mill did not sell for more in consequence?—I do not think the mill sold for a halfpenny more. The property was sold as a whole.

“Mr. Brynmor Jones.

“It appears to have been a blunder altogether, because if these were tenants’ fixtures they would not be taken into account by anybody.

“Lord Kenyon.

“70,951. ‘In fact did you leave him to his strict legal rights?’—Yes.”

A trumpery little story enough, it will be said; but it must have cost some ten pounds in the rebutting, and one may well understand how it came about that scores of stories, equally trumpery, of which the persons assailed may often not have heard until this day, went un rebutted and unexplained. Most of the mischief came from the admission of evidence of ancient date which could neither be verified nor contradicted, and from the encouragement of evidence by third parties, who sometimes were found not to have been so much as in communication with the persons alleged to be aggrieved. One flagrant instance, out of many, will suffice to show this. A Mr. E. Jones-Williams gave evidence at Llangefni on October 12, 1893, to the effect that a widow of a deceased tenant had been compelled to purchase, at the full value, the farm which her husband had improved; had, in short, been compelled to pay for the improvements twice over. Mr. E. Jones-Williams was apparently an entire stranger to the transaction.

Lord Carrington, in examining the Rev. J. W. Wynne Jones, who came forward to rebut as the son of the deceased owner, said:

“65,234. The point you wish to rebut is as to no compensation being given?—No compensation—that is it.

“65,235. Now tell us what you have to say?—I have a

draft receipt, an agreement for £500 compensation that was allowed to her.

“65,236. Mr. Jones Williams said no compensation was allowed when the land was sold?—Yes. *This* is a draft of the agreement. [*Handing same.*] I am quite willing to go into the other matters, if you wish it.

“65,237. All the rest is admitted?—No, by no means, but that is one I have a point blank answer to, if you will keep to that question.”

Mr. Wynne Jones then produced a copy, subsequently verified by production of the original, of the agreement of purchase, which clearly showed that the woman (who most likely never had any communication with the witness) had received in effect no less than £500 compensation. True no money passed; but she got the farm for £500 less than she had agreed to pay. Here is the instrument:

“Memorandum of agreement made this fifth day of November one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, between the Reverend John William Wynne Jones, of the Vicarage, in the town and county of Carnarvon, clerk in holy orders, Robert Iorwerth Wynne Jones, of Warrington, in the county of Esquire, and the Reverend Llewelyn Wynne Jones, of Chirk Vicarage, Ruabon, in the county of Denbigh, clerk in holy orders (hereinafter called the trustees), of the one part, and Jane Jones, of Cymmynod, in the parish of Bodelern, in the county of Anglesey, widow, of the other part. Whereas the said Jane Jones or her predecessors are and for some years past have been tenants of the said farm called Cymmynod under the late Venerable Archdeacon Wynne Jones, deceased, and during their said tenancy have executed certain improvements on the said premises by building, manuring, and draining, for which they allege themselves to have a certain claim for compensation. And whereas the

said Archdeacon Wynne Jones is now dead, and the said premises were by his will devised to the said trustees in trust for sale. And whereas the said Jane Jones has agreed to purchase the said farm called Cymmynod from the said trustees for the price of three thousand five hundred pounds. *Now it is witnessed that the said trustees hereby agree to pay to the said Jane Jones the sum of five hundred pounds, and the said Jane Jones hereby agrees to accept the said sum of five hundred pounds in full discharge of all claims by her or her predecessors and her or their executors, administrators and assigns for compensation for or in respect of any improvement by draining, building, or manuring, or in any other manner whatsoever upon the said premises executed by her or them, and hereby agrees to release on payment of the said sum the said trustees, their estate and effects, and estate of the said Archdeacon Wynne Jones, deceased, and undertake to indemnify them from and against all claims for or on account of the same. In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands the day and year first above written."*

The foregoing narrative may be taken as a fair sample of the manner in which numerous allegations of this kind were rebutted.

The only marvel is that so many allegations of this kind—for the alleged confiscation is identical in character, whether it takes place by way of sale or by way of raising rent—were rebutted.

But since to go through them all is impossible, and to prove a negative is unsatisfactory at best, the more convenient plan will be to set forth some of the positive evidence as to expenditure on repairs and improvements made by landowners in North Wales. This expenditure, be it remembered, can only be given as typical, for, since the question what are and are not agricultural improvements must sometimes be

controversial, it was not considered fair to offer to the Commission a classified extract from returns such as those as to abatements and reductions and history of rental collected by the late Mr. George Owen, which are contained in the appendix. For every item of evidence contained in the following pages an individual witness had to be called, to learn sometimes from the Chairman that there had been a great deal of evidence of similar character—as if every figure of it was not valuable—and to subject himself to cross-examination, not only by the Commissioners, but by every bystander who had a trumpety grievance to air, or an ancient grudge to avenge. It cannot be described as other than a creditable record.

Here we have Mr. Wynne of Peniarth (Merionethshire):

“9534. Then, will you put in the amount spent for repairs? —Yes. ‘From 1870 to 1892, both inclusive, there has been spent in repairs and improvements the sum of £24,760; in buildings and repairs, £11,981, and in drainage, £12,779.’ With regard to buildings and repairs, bar £2 12s. 6d., which is a trifling item that I mentioned to you, I never charged, or my father before me, one single farthing for buildings. With regard to drainage, in addition to this £12,779, there was another £5000 spent a few years further back, and I do not think I got 1 per cent. upon the whole outlay for the whole thing. In addition to that, it is done under the Land Drainage Acts, and I am liable on the ordinary rate; that, now, is made to pay generally about £180 to £200 a year for what is called the Maintenance rate, to keep up these farms, in order to command the rents where they have been raised at all by the drainage. The details can be given. From 1857 to 1863 there has been about £1200 to £1400, and the interest on this may be about £35. Between 1863 and 1870 there has been about £5000 spent in drainage, and the total increase of rental for these last sums, £5000 and £12,779, total £17,779, is about £138 to £140 per annum. Then

against that I have got to set about £2000 a year, roughly speaking, in outlay to keep the thing up, in order to command rents."

Here again, is the evidence of Colonel Lynes, the owner of 3000 acres in Denbighshire, and 2200 in Merionethshire :

"6666. I have received close upon £10,000 within the last five years, and I have had £973 13s. 8d. myself out of that. Each item is put down here and the improvements and estate expenses come to close upon £6000 out of it. The other is law expenses and expenses connected with the estate, such as tithes, charity, and things of that sort. I can show here in detail that out of about close upon £10,000, as I say, I have not had £1000 myself; I have spent the whole of the remainder on the property.

"6667. Nine thousand pounds out of £10,000 has been spent on the property?—Nine thousand pounds out of £10,000 has been spent on the property, and out of that close upon £6000 absolutely in improvements and estate expenses."

In this case Colonel Lynes admitted, quite frankly, that the property had been neglected for many years prior to his coming into possession.

Mr. Owen Slaney Wynne, ex-agent of Sir Watkin Williams Wynne was able to give the expenditure on Sir Watkin's estate (in 5 counties) during his period of office.

"8190. You have no objection to saying it is Sir Watkin's estate?—None at all. Building and repairs:—1872, £6859; 1873, £5951; 1874, £8403; 1875, £7703; 1876, £8825; 1877, £8248; 1878, £8862; 1879, £6568; 1880, £7474; 1881, £7996; 1882, £6741; 1883, £6369; 1884, £5974; 1885, £6135; 1886, £5467; 1887, £5685. That is the

year I gave up the agency. Those figures amount in all to £113,460, and that was spent in building and repairing."

He added that on the estate of Mr. J. Vaughan of Nannau (Merionethshire), rented at £4200, the expenditure in improvements and repairs in the last 12 years had been about £10,000.

Mr. Charles A. Jones (Merionethshire) (8437) showed a gross rental of £130 and an expenditure, in the past two years, of £160.

The Hon. R. H. Eden, agent for Lord Dudley (Merionethshire), did not enter into figures, but that Lord Dudley is at great expense in relation to his 10,000 acres is clear from his statement.

"The landlord finds the drain pipes on these farms, and he protects the land from river encroachment when it gets bad, and he finds the gates and posts and wire fencing; he has also had granaries built, and erected more buildings generally, and he has always been charged with those improvements and no interest has been charged on it.

"9162. What about the draining?—In a general way the landlord finds the pipes and the tenant puts them in, and if rent is a little dearer we put the pipes in as a bonus."

This is the evidence of Mr. Walter B. C. Jones touching Mr. Nanney's estate (Merionethshire and Carnarvonshire):

"Since I was appointed agent in 1871 there has been spent through the estate account the sum of £34,200 up to December 31, 1892, upon repairs, and renewals, and new buildings and materials furnished the tenants. Individual examples taken from the repairs ledger are given."

The following passage contains Colonel the Hon. W. E.

Sackville West's statement of expenditure on the Penrhyn estate (mainly Carnarvonshire):

"12,096. From 1867 to 1892 a sum of £129,207 15s. 8*d.* has been spent on repairs and improvements. In some cases interest has been charged for a time, but has in nearly all cases been remitted. In addition to this a sum of about £47,993 has been spent on workmen's cottages, making a total of £177,200 15s. 8*d.* or thereabouts during 26 years. During the last six years £29,214 has been spent on farms, and £13,007 10s. 1*d.* has been returned in cash abatements."

Captain Stewart gave the following figures for the Vaynol estate of Mr. Assheton Smith (mainly Carnarvonshire):

"13,493. Then give us the particulars and details of moneys, if you please, spent in repairs?—From 1857 to 1866, that is 10 years, £70,497, that sum includes £780 8s. 11*d.* compensation to tenants for unexhausted improvements; 1867 to 1876, that is 10 years again, £89,506, including £2541 11s. 4*d.* compensation to tenants for unexhausted improvements; 1877 to 1886, that is 10 years, £98,941, including £2430 18s. 3*d.* compensation to tenants for unexhausted improvements; 1887 to 1892, that is 5 years, £48,422, and that sum includes £569 4s. 3*d.* compensation to tenants for unexhausted improvements. The total amount expended from the year 1886 is £307,866. The total amount paid to tenants for compensation for unexhausted improvements is £6321 12s. 9*d.*"

Colonel Wynne Finch showed (Denbighshire and Carnarvonshire), in a table which he put in, that his expenditure in this respect had been £25,413 7s. 6*d.* since 1872.

Mr. H. D. Pochin, on an estate of 2500–3000 acres (Flintshire), purchased 20 years ago for £36,000, showed an ex-

penditure of £86,000. The investment, which brought him in between $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 per cent. only, was, he said, "the poorest investment I ever made in my life."

Major Sandbach of Hafodunos (Flintshire) showed an expenditure during the past 60 years of £3802 14s. on cottages alone and on improvements and repairs of over £100,000. He added :

"Not entirely. Every farmstead has been entirely rebuilt or large additions made to the existing buildings. All wet land has been drained. 300 acres of plantations made for shelter, which have softened and improved the climate. 100 miles of old banks and hedges have been pulled down and grubbed up, and the fields remodelled, and new quick fences made ; mostly planted and protected at the landlord's expense ; but in all cases the landlord has provided the quicks, also posts and wire to protect the hedges until grown. Watercourses and ditches have been made and paved, and much land from waste common turned into good sound arable land. I should like to mention that 16 miles of road from Abergele to Llanrwst was made entirely at Mr. Sandbach's expense, at a cost of over £12,000 ; it was made under a public Act, but he found the money for it."

Mr. Price of Rhiwlas (Merionethshire) showed an expenditure from 1873 to 1876 of £4000 on draining, and from 1876 to 1893 of £1700 on pipes. He was then questioned, "What money have you spent on repairs and improvements?"

"I have spent over £100,000 on repairs the last 30 years. I cannot tell you the exact sum, but it is considerably over £100,000. From the year 1877 to 1886 inclusive, the sum of £23,134 16s. 6d. was spent on this estate in repairs and improvements, and the sum of £9998 19s. 6d. has been

spent on improvements made for the benefit of my tenants from 1887 to 1891 inclusive. It is about 25 per cent. per annum on the income. During the last 30 years I have expended at least £100,000 on repairs and improvements, and in no case of such improvements has any interest been charged; neither are the rents raised as a rule."

The following table of expenditure was handed in by Sir H. B. Robertson (Merionethshire), whose estate is about 3500 acres:

					£	s.	d.
1876	.	.	.	.	1,129	2	10
1877	.	.	.	.	1,292	19	1
1878	.	.	.	.	2,199	0	7
1879	.	.	.	.	1,896	15	4
1880	.	.	.	.	888	18	7
1881	.	.	.	.	1,216	11	2
1882	.	.	.	.	525	13	3
1883	.	.	.	.	998	14	4
1884	.	.	.	.	1,868	7	8
1885	.	.	.	.	1,704	3	1
1886	.	.	.	.	1,311	6	2
1887	.	.	.	.	189	6	8
1888	.	.	.	.	434	16	9
1889	.	.	.	.	522	3	9
1890	.	.	.	.	516	0	7
1891	.	.	.	.	531	14	10
1892	.	.	.	.	909	12	4
1893 to 30th June	.	.	.	.	280	5	1
					18,415	12	1
Prior to 1876	.	.	.	.	7,700	0	0
					£26,115	12	1

Mr. Prichard of Llwydiarth Esgob said, in answer to the usual question relating to the late Sir George Meyrick's Bodorgan estate (Anglesey) of 17,000 acres :

"On the Bodorgan estate we have spent £19,400 in 19 years, and no interest has been charged for money spent in this period, except in one or two special cases."

Lord Stanley of Alderley's account for his Anglesey estate stands thus :

	£	s.	d.
Spent, 1851 to 1871, leaving out 1852 and 1856, accounts for which are lost	3086	0	0
From 1872 to 1892	4475	0	0
Covered Market at Amlwch . .	570	0	0
Tiles for new dairies	269	5	2
On improvements other than buildings (<i>e.g.</i> , draining, water- courses, sea-walls)	439	5	9

This, again, is the testimony of Captain Preston :

"On Sir Richard Bulkeley's Baron Hill estate (Anglesey), within thirty years, about £7868 have been spent by the landlord in building new houses, farm buildings, repairing old buildings, and other improvements. In some cases the rents were raised, but subsequently reduced. On the Honourable Lady Neave's estate (Anglesey) the houses and out-buildings have been erected, as well as general repairs, without increasing the rents. In every case where repairs are necessary, timber and slates have been allowed. Drainage pipes have been given to all that require them."

Moving on to Denbighshire, we find Mr. R. T. Wickham speaking thus:

"The whole of the improvements or increase of houses and buildings are taken by the landlord. Alterations and improvements to brook banks, rivers, or water-courses are done by the landlord, if at all. The above are done without any repayment or interest whatever. The landlord also buys pipes for draining, and often does the labour. He often finds bones for grass land, and it is quite exceptional for him to get anything in return. The tenants do alterations to fences if they think it will pay. They find the labour for draining and boning and the carting of materials for alterations and repairs. If carting for materials is done for a farm not the tenant's, or for the Hall, I think in every case we pay for it. As to drainage, all these things, again, have been largely done by the landlord. In fact, I think the whole of these matters under this paragraph have been done by the landlord. Drainage and irrigation, tanks for preserving liquid manure, river banks, fences, and so on. . . . If the tenant will keep it up it is as much as we can ask, and more than we mostly get."

Sir T. H. G. Puleston (Flintshire) summarised his outlay on his property at £24,499 from 1868 to 1894 (the income being between £3000 and £4000) about 27 per cent., said Mr. Commissioner Grove. Mr. T. Griffith Boscawen showed for Lord Kenyon (Flintshire) expenditure from 1887 to 1893 of £8420, 12½ per cent of the gross, and 24 per cent. of the net income. Mr. J. H. W. Lee, for the Hanmer estate (Flintshire), showed an expenditure of 32 per cent. of the gross income for 6½ years.

On behalf of Lord Trevor (Denbighshire), the Hon. G. E. Trevor, speaking of the history, since 1880, of a property of about 1000 acres, purchased in 1862, said:

“57,775. Owing to the cause I have already mentioned, I am afraid I cannot produce the vouchers I should like to do, but I have put down the following list: New Hall Farm we have vouchers for £1476 11s. 8d., which does not in any way represent what has been done; Old Hall Farm, £428 2s. 2d.; Bankhouse Farm, £158 6s. 8d.; Tallarn Green Farm, £92 17s. 8d.; Plassy Farm, £152 19s. 1d. The bills for the rebuilding of the Hall and the foregoing premises I cannot obtain, so that this in no way represents the rebuilding. Miscellaneous repairs, £356, making a total of £3014 5s. 3d., vouchers for which I have been able to bring.”

Mr. P. P. Pennant (Flintshire), referring to a property of 1400 acres, said: “The expenditure during forty years, that is to say, from 1854 to 1894, on improvements, has been £7606, and on repairs £10,020.” Colonel Lloyd Howard (Denbighshire) showed that, by reason of his expenditure, and that of his father, on repairs, taxes, &c., 43 per cent. only of the gross income had been received, £12,000 out of £28,000 received having been spent on repairs. Mr. Pickering showed that Lord Mostyn (Flintshire) had spent in repairs and improvements, during 11½ years, £11,400, on allowances to tenants and for unexhausted improvements £7735, or 29 per cent. of the rental.

Mr. J. Taylor showed that on the estates of Mr. Buddicombe (Flintshire), the Earl of Denbigh, the Dowager Lady Vivian (Anglesey), Sir Pyers Mostyn (Flintshire), and Mr. A. C. Lewis, all repairs (and this word carries with it in most cases the idea of permanent improvements) were done by the owners. This, indeed, is virtually the story of all estates.

Here, again, is the evidence of Mr. Ll. J. Henry as to the Duke of Westminster's Halkyn estate (Flintshire) of 2730 acres in Flintshire, rented at £2971, with the questions of the Chairman added:

"The Duke does all the repairs and improvements on the estate. The tenants do the cartage and the Duke pays them for doing so. In the case of new buildings erected at the request of the tenant, the tenant carts the materials free of charge, and the same with pipes for drainage, but the Duke never charges any percentage upon new buildings, or for repairs or improvements. The Duke also pays all costs of drainage except as above-mentioned; the tenant carries the pipes. There are no leases, only annual agreements, on the estate. I have been carefully through the estate books for a number of years past, and I find that—

	There was expended on the estate for Repairs.			There was also expended on the same estate for Improvements during the same period.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Between 1857 and 1866	22,993	12	3	13,128	8	6
„ 1867 and 1877	17,948	15	5	2,734	12	5
„ 1877 and 1886	11,973	12	1	7,693	8	7

"From the last date to the present time I may safely state that £20,000 have been expended in repairs and improvements."

He was then questioned a little.

"59,272. From 1886 to 1894, £20,000 has been expended in repairs and improvements?—Yes.

"59,273. Could you separate them?—I am afraid I could not off-hand.

"59,274. If we took it about half each, would that be about it?—I think that would be about it.

"59,275. Then for many years more income has been spent on the estate than the income derived?—Yes.

"59,276. That is to say, if the proprietor of this estate had

no other means there would have been nothing for him or for his family?—Nothing, my lord.

“59,277. He would have had nothing to spend at all for his own living?—No; His Grace will have nothing at all this year.”

The following questions, addressed to the same witness, by Sir J. Llewelyn show his impartiality:

“59,278. Is that owing to the bad state of repairs previously?—Well, I have only had five years’ experience of the Duke’s estate, but for very many years beyond the five there has been this heavy expenditure upon the estate—for twenty-six years, I dare say.

“59,279. That sort of condition of things cannot go on?—Well, I hope it will not.”

Colonel Cornwallis West (Denbighshire) gave some interesting particulars showing (1) the relation borne by the rent to the mere value of buildings, and (2) the comparative rental of sundry farms, denoted by letters of the alphabet, in 1819 and 1894 respectively. They are appended:

RUTHIN ESTATE.

Acreage.				Rent.		Value of Buildings.		Interest at 4 per cent. on Value.		Balance of Rent.	
A.	R.	P.		£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
A.	33	0	14	40	0 0	900	0 0	36	0 0	4	0 0
B.	185	1	20	140	0 0	3,000	0 0	120	0 0	20	0 0
C.	42	1	5	87	10 0	1,500	0 0	60	0 0	27	10 0
D.	40	0	0	36	0 0	800	0 0	32	0 0	4	0 0
E.	62	0	0	58	0 0	900	0 0	26	0 0	22	0 0
F.	102	2	3	111	0 0	1,000	0 0	40	0 0	71	0 0
465	1	2		472	10 0	8,100	0 0	324	0 0	148	10 0

THE LAND QUESTION

LLANARMON ESTATE.

Acreage.				Rent.			Value of Buildings.			Interest at 4 per cent. on Value.			Balance of Rent.		
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
A.	139	0	18	77	0	0	1,800	0	0	72	0	0	5	0	0
B.	260	0	23	66	0	0	1,800	0	0	72	0	0	Nil.		
C.	403	0	1	95	0	0	2,000	0	0	80	0	0	15	0	0
D.	395	2	30	67	0	0	1,100	0	0	44	0	0	23	0	0
E.	471	1	31	63	0	0	800	0	0	32	0	0	31	0	0
F.	443	3	38	110	0	0	1,300	0	0	52	0	0	58	0	0
G.	150	0	2	61	0	0	900	0	0	36	0	0	25	0	0
H.	676	0	5	104	0	0	2,000	0	0	80	0	0	24	0	0
I.	131	2	3	88	10	0	1,800	0	0	72	0	0	16	10	0
J.	190	0	25	31	10	0	700	0	0	28	0	0	3	10	0
K.	224	0	3	73	10	0	1,500	0	0	60	0	0	13	10	0
L.	138	1	33	38	0	0	700	0	0	28	0	0	10	0	0
4,623 2 12				874 10 0			16,400 0 0			656 0 0			224 10 0		

Acreage in 1819.			Rent in 1819.			Rent per Acre in 1819.	Acreage in 1894.			Rent in 1894.			Per Acre.		
A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.	£	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
A.	195	2	11	316	0	6	1	12	0	186	2	5	265	0	0
B.	468	1	14	445	19	0	0	19	0	416	3	24	460	0	0
C.	366	1	26	442	6	0	1	9	0	330	0	0	360	0	0
D.	55	2	26	31	1	9	0	11	3	66	0	0	42	0	0
E.	220	1	17	159	0	0	0	14	5	185	0	0	140	0	0
1,306 1 14			1,394 7 3			—	1,184 1 29			1,267 0 0			—		

The statement as to expenditure in improvements and repairs was made by his agent, Mr. Probert, thus, in answer to questions :

“60,630. Now, tell us about the improvements?—As different estates have different rules, I cannot say generally what is done. On the Ruthin Castle estate drainage and buildings for stock, implements and cart-sheds, protection

from river encroachments, iron and wire fences in special cases, gates and posts, attending to roofs and chimneys, and sometimes seed: the improvements made were £11,170 and about £35,000 in reconstruction and repairs since 1868, for which the landlord receives no interest. That £11,170 is in drainage principally, and new buildings.

"60,631. Do the new buildings come in reconstruction and repairs?—No.

"60,632. In the £11,170?—In the £11,170.

"60,633. What is the £35,000?—The £35,000 is in repairs to buildings and increased accommodation now and then, but the £11,170 was borrowed money at the time, repayable by instalments covering 25 years, which I think Colonel West referred to in his evidence."

Mr. W. Corbet Yale gave evidence that he did the whole of the improvements on his estate (Denbighshire), and testified, as did many other owners and many tenants, to the prevailing friendliness of feeling. Next comes Colonel George Mousley's evidence as to Mrs. Naylor Leyland's (Denbighshire) estate of 3900 acres:

"During the past 29 years there has been expended a sum of £33,375 18s. 6d. on new buildings and repairs, and a further sum of £7926 16s. 11d. on drainage and other improvements, making a total of £41,302 15s. 11d., which gives an average expenditure of £1424 4s. 8d. The above sum of £41,302 15s. 11d. includes the cost of building eight new farmhouses and nine new cottages. No interest has ever been charged on moneys expended in buildings and improvement excepting as to the sum of £1920 spent upon draining in 1869, on which 5 per cent. interest, amounting to £96, was charged, but that has long since been absorbed."

Lord Bagot's (Denbighshire) agent spoke to an expenditure

of £98,000 in 39 years. The statement of Mr. W. D. Griffith, of Garn (Denbighshire), as to the expenditure on his estate follows:

“*Expenditure on Estate.*—In the 12 years, 1881–1892, I have spent £3975 7s. 7d. on the repairs and improvement of the farms on the estate, excluding £430 16s. spent on the maintenance in repair of cottages in the village of Henllan, or an annual average of £331 5s. 7d. The property on which the larger named sum was spent produced in 1880 a rental of £2241, and in 1892 £1723, thus an average of £330 a year, or taking the rental over 12 years at the medium sum of £2000, which is too much, an average of 16 per cent. of the rental was spent on repairs and improvements. I may say that this was prepared at the beginning of 1893, in view of the Commission coming here. In the year 1893 £391 9s. 1d. was expended on repairs, and nearly £600 have been already expended up to the 31st of August of this year, 1894. I also wish to observe that this amount does not include anything for agency, or for superintendence of any kind. That is all done by myself. Therefore the amount would be really larger if I paid for superintendence and agency work. No interest has ever been charged to any tenant on the estate for any repair or improvement of any kind, not even for draining.”

This is the evidence of Mr. Parker, agent to Mr. Middleton Biddulph, of Chirk Castle (Denbighshire):

“ From 1880 to 1893, the expenditure on improve-	
ments and repairs (exclusive of cottages) has	£
amounted to	8,026
“ Permanent reductions during that time	3,436
“ Temporary abatements amounted to	6,240
“ Arrears remitted	178
	£17,880

“An average during the last 14 years of £1277 per annum, or 22 per cent. on the rental of £5708 of the farms referred to.”

Major Birch gave evidence on this point as to the estates of Llannerch (Sir G. A. Cayley, 2040 acres, rent £2632), and Gwysanau (Mr. P. B. Davies Cooke, 3687 acres, rent £4311), Plas Heaton (Major Heaton, 1200 acres), Hartsheath and Geltegynan (2900 acres, rent £2500) (all in Denbigh and Flint). For Gwysanau he showed expenditure on materials, repairs, and improvements (1886–1894), of £11,532; on Llannerch, previous to 1878, the whole income was spent for twelve years, and from 1886–1892, £6924. Mr. Wynne Edwards, for a not very large estate, gave the following evidence:

“All permanent improvements are made by the landlord in this district, the improvements effected by the tenants being in cultivation. Drainage and irrigation is done by the landlord. Buildings for stock are built by the landlord. Tanks for liquid manure are not much used. Protection from encroachment by the landlord. Fences, gates, and posts are done by the landlord. Small repairs to fabric of buildings by the landlord. Manures (except in cases) and seeds by the tenant. Consequently the tenants do not often apply for consent for specific improvements.”

Mr. St. John Charlton showed the expenditure on the Kimmel estate (Flintshire) to have been, in six years:

	£
New buildings and repairs . . .	15,301
Drainage and interest on drainage . .	5,871

Mr. O. J. Williams showed an expenditure on £1200 a year (out of £2342 rent) on the Cefn estate (Denbighshire).

Mr. W. Forrester Addie, for Lord Powis (Montgomeryshire), gave the following summary of expenditure from Lady Day, 1840, to Lady Day, 1891, and further showed that Lord Powis's income was not quite the half of his rental:

	£
Buildings	242,709
Draining	64,805
Fencing	21,223
	£328,737

We come next to Colonel H. R. Hughes, chief agent of the Wynnstay Estates (5 counties), who gave evidence elaborate, minute and weighty in no common measure, showing for example that annual interest on purchased estates, exclusive of deduction for repairs and allowances was, in respect of a rental of £2355 only $3\frac{9}{10}$ per cent. on the average. He also summarised the expenditure from 1862–1893 thus:

	£	s.	d.
Fencing, gates, wood, &c.	54,173	14	5
Building and repairs	216,731	2	6
Draining	24,328	15	4
Total for 32 years ending 1893	£295,233	12	3

and he added:

“In addition to this large sum there has been an expenditure during the same period of £103,713 13s. 6d. on buildings, and also repairs of cottages within the Park walls and other property at Ruabon and elsewhere, which, as it does not affect the tenant farmers, I do not propose further to allude to.

“Of the above sum of £295,233, the present Sir Watkin

and Lady Williams Wynn have spent during the six years ending 1893 :—

	£	s.	d.
On farm buildings and repairs .	61,980	0	0
On gates, fencing, woods, &c. .	16,579	12	9
On draining	3,621	17	11
Or a total of	82,181	10	8
in addition to giving rebates amounting to	30,026	0	0
Total	112,207	10	8

or an average deduction from their rental of £18,700 per annum, being 41 per cent. of that rental."

Mr. R. W. Henry (Montgomeryshire) showed that on the Marchioness of Londonderry's estate the outgoings other than personal and household exceeded the rental, and the expenditure on building, draining, fencing, and improvements was equal to $28\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of his rental. Mr. Edward Davies of Plas Dinam, a very valuable witness in all respects, showed (1) a total expenditure in eight years on the Plas Dinam Estate of £15,000 in eight years; practically absorbing the whole of the rental: (2) an expenditure on the Gwernygoe estate of £21,000 in nineteen years.

Colonel Drew on behalf of the Clochfaen estate handed in the following table, showing amounts expended in building, improvements, and repairs on the several holdings from 1887 up to June 1894:

Holding	Tenant.	Annual Rent.	Repairs, &c., 1887 to 1894.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Aberldidno . . .	Jones, Ed. . .	20 0 0	3 13 11
Black Lion . . .	Anwy, Mrs. . .	76 0 0	1,082 4 1½
Blaen-y-cwm . . .	Pryse, J. R. . .	35 0 0	22 7 3
Brithdir . . .	Pugh, J. . .	13 0 0	1 10 11
Bryn-cyllan . . .	Lewis, Ed. . .	24 0 0	15 7 7
Bryn-hyfyrd . . .	Rees, Elizth. . .	55 0 0	8 2 10
Cefn-beidiog . . .	Evans and Beedle	30 0 0	22 2 4
Cefn Chapel . . .	Trustees . . .	1 0 0	—
Cil-gwrgan . . .	Griffiths, T. and J.	26 0 0	111 18 9
Coed-cae . . .	Edwards, R. D. . .	40 0 0	0 5 3
Dernol . . .	Pryse, Evan . . .	64 0 0	4 4 11
Ffai-y-gof . . .	George, W. . .	—	8 18 9
Felin fawr . . .	Mills, J. . .	14 0 0	0 7 3
Lluest-dol-gwiall . . .	Griffiths, E. . .	50 0 0	49 15 7
Gelli-fawr . . .	Morgans, E. . .	50 0 0	85 7 8
Hafod-lydan . . .	Rees, — . . .	12 0 0	2 9 6
Hirbrig . . .	Jones, T. . .	14 0 0	11 1 11
Minffordd . . .	Evans, D. . .	3 0 0	2 1 6
Nantgwernog . . .	Bywater, T. . .	32 0 0	135 8 0
Pandy-gwyn . . .	Davies, Margt. . .	2 10 0	—
Pen-y-bont Chapel ¹ . . .	Trustees . . .	4 6 0	—
Carreg-y-Dwla . . .	Hughes, T. . .	20 0 0	3 9 5
Pen-y-bryn . . .	Parry, W. . .	9 0 0	0 17 4½
Pen-y-erোসau . . .	Griffith, J. T. . .	9 0 0	3 13 1
Pen-y-erugyn . . .	Lloyd, D. and T. . .	32 0 0	2 1 4
Pen-y-geulan . . .	Evans, J. . .	58 0 0	23 9 4½
Prys-sylwydd . . .	Rowlands, J. . .	45 0 0	10 5 6
Rhiwlas . . .	Lewis, B. . .	10 0 0	—
Rhiw-y-erোসau . . .	Davis, Martha . . .	0 1 0	—
Shop fawr . . .	Owen, Thomas . . .	20 0 0	512 1 8
Smithy . . .	Rees, D. . .	13 0 0	4 0 0
Tan-y-berth . . .	Pugh, Wm. . .	48 0 0	20 2 8
Tan-y-llwyn, Voel, } and Ystrad olwyn }	Jones, S. and D. . .	{ 40 0 0 } { 102 16 0 }	543 10 5
Tan-yr-allt . . .	Pryce, J. . .	45 0 0	32 2 6
Troed-yr-esgair . . .	Griffith, John . . .	56 0 0	15 6 4
Tygwyn . . .	Evans, R. . .	20 0 0	174 13 10
Tyn-y-coed . . .	Davies, E. . .	21 10 0	128 1 8½
Tyn-y-ddol . . .	Thomas, D. . .	80 0 0	47 8 0
Tyn-y-maes and } Clochfaen uchaf }	Davies, E. . .	149 0 0	92 18 0
Wern . . .	Davies, S. . .	20 0 0	0 15 6
Quillet . . .	Rev. J. H. Hughes	0 10 0	—
		1,374 15 0	3,182 4 9

Mr. G. D. Harrison gave this evidence touching the Leighton estate (Montgomeryshire):

“Between the years 1865 and 1893 there was expended

upon the Leighton estate, on farmhouses and buildings, cottages, and tenants' holdings, in repairs and improvements, the sum of £101,199 6s. 9d., made up as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
General repairs to tenants' holdings			
upon the estate	54,465	10	4
New buildings	35,750	11	0½
Draining	5,366	18	11
For cottages and fences	4,098	7	1½
For approaches to Leighton Bridge near Welshpool	1,517	19	4
Making a total of	101,199	6	9

“The net rental for the same period was £105,892 2s. 7d., showing an average expenditure upon repairs and improvements of 95½ per cent. of the rentals, or, deducting the item of £1517 19s. 4d. in respect of the Leighton Bridge approaches, there is an actual expenditure of £99,681 7s. 5d. upon purely tenants' holdings during the period in question, and giving a percentage upon the rental for the same period of 94.”

These are figures, culled from the official minutes verbatim; each statement being taken in the form in which it happened to be given so that there may be no suspicion that the extracts are either garbled or selected. And surely no better case need be desired by the witnesses representing any body of men in any part of the kingdom.

CHAPTER XI.

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883, unfair to both Parties to the Contract—substituted Scales of Compensation—the Act a Dead Letter in Glamorganshire, where custom is better—the Act killed the Development of less perfect Custom elsewhere—Amendments of the Act, on just Principles, desired.

Rents of small Farms necessarily higher in Proportion than those of large—Case for North Wales Landowners summarised—they have established, before a hostile Commission, the Right to even Treatment with English Landowners—they ask justice.

LANDOWNERS, however, have no desire to put their case too high upon the question of compensation for improvements. They admit that the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883, which at present embodies the law with regard to compensation for improvements laid down for their guidance by the wisdom of Parliament, is defective from the point of view of both tenant and landowner, is defective in Wales as it is in England, and in precisely the same measure in England as in Wales. Many of them have tried, to the best of their ability, to amend the Act by substituting improved, more generous and more appropriate scales of compensation for these which are contained in the Statute. None will be more ready than landowners to welcome any well-considered reforms which the present Administration of this country proposes to make in the law of compensation; none will be more ready than landowners to accede cordially to the most generous scale of compensation so long as that scale is based upon principles strictly just to both sides. Such principles may be defined with consummate ease in a sentence or two, although when the

consideration of points of detail is reached there is room for difference of opinion. Perfection they do not anticipate, and perfection is, under the circumstances, that for which no reasoning man will see reason to hope. As the landowners and tenant farmers of Glamorganshire have shown, by evolving a custom which not only has virtually the force of law, but also has absolutely ousted a law purporting to forbid contracting out, and has caused it to be a dead letter, so man and man, bargaining together, can reach an agreement far more satisfactory to both parties than any statutory form of contract is ever likely to be. Nor is it right to assume, because in North Wales no custom of the kind has arisen, that the farmers of North Wales are not every whit as shrewd as their brethren in Glamorganshire, or that they do not make their bargain with their landlords, when they make any at all, with the same freedom as their fellows in South Wales. The plain fact is that the circumstances are different. The long tables of hereditary succession, the long lists of rents unaltered save by reduction or by slight increases due to external circumstances, which have been given in the text and are amplified in the Appendix, go far to show that tenancy is hereditary in families and that, so long as farms remain in the hands of the original owner and his family, the occupiers will not be disturbed. Wherever a suitable member of the family is forthcoming to succeed a deceased tenant he is accepted; the only question is which, of various applicants all connected with the original family of tenants by blood or marriage, shall be chosen. Consequently the question of compensation rises but rarely, and custom as to compensation has been slow in development. The families who have been in possession for hundreds of years on the Penrhyn, Vaynol, Wynnstay, and other estates naturally do not concern themselves with the question of the respective rights of landowner and tenant in the event of the determination of the tenancy otherwise than by death;

for no idea of the kind enters into his mind and he knows, and is right in knowing, that he and his posterity are perfectly secure in tenancy. Whatever improvements he makes will be his and in making them he will receive generous assistance from his landlord whom he regards as a friend, with interests identical with his, and in many ways as an equal. So you find such a man as Colonel the Hon. W. E. Sackville West, who as Lord Penrhyn's agent has had the care of a very large number of holdings for many years, saying that "he has no experience of the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act." In Glamorganshire the case is different. It contains half the population of Wales nearly; it is instinct with the spirit of commercial and industrial enterprise; there are many more openings for young men there than are to be found in the North. Pastoral valleys (the Rhondda for example) have become centres of teeming populations of colliers; there are a thousand avenues, real or imaginary, but all seductive, to fortune. So each farmer feels that his sons may leave the ancestral occupation and work out their destiny in other spheres of life. Consequently each agreement of tenancy has a tendency to be regarded, particularly by the tenant, as temporary. He wants to be secure that judicious outlay shall not be lost if he quits farming, or moves to another farm, or if coal is discovered under his holding.

The only reason why custom, which is in effect the essence of agreement in common form, has not advanced by equal stages and with equal rapidity in North Wales is that the necessity has not been felt by reason of the difference of conditions. In due time the landowners and farmers of North Wales, when the necessity was felt, would have reached a state of custom as to compensation similar in point of principle, but entirely dissimilar in points of detail—for the physical conditions of the two districts are entirely distinct—to that which has been reached in Glamorganshire. Even

there, curiously enough, there is a custom of the East and a custom of the West, totally different, and this in itself is a circumstance which tends to show the difficulties standing in the way of the Legislature. No Act of Parliament can meet adequately the varying needs of men under different combinations of circumstances. But the simple fact is that the Agricultural Holdings Act put an absolute stop to development or evolution, except by special agreement, which the Commissioners persistently regarded with a suspicion that seemed hardly intelligent. You must, as has been said before, have compensation by statute or by custom ; but it is impossible to have both ; either the statute will oust the custom and stop its development, or the custom will oust the statute and pursue its course of evolution in spite of and without regard to the statute.

Meanwhile there is the statute and, since there are no steps backward in legislation, and, an economical mistake once made, it is impossible to return to the *status quo ante*, and since landowner and tenant are agreed that the statute must be amended, amended it must be. It remains only to be hoped that it will be amended in a just spirit. It is unjust on the one hand that a landowner should be improved out of his property against his will, that is to say, that he should be compelled to look on while his tenant makes changes, which he is pleased to call improvements, at his own sweet will and pleasure, to such an extent that the landowner cannot resume occupation save at a ruinous expense which he does not desire to, and perhaps cannot, incur. On the other hand it is entirely contrary to elementary justice that the law should be such that when the intention of a tenant to make certain improvements has been brought fairly to the landowner's notice he should then escape payment on the ground that he has received no formal notice. That is the main principle to be followed. But there are minor points. Possibly, for example, there may be something

in the alleged grievance of tenants that they have not been compensated for haulage of materials for the improvements done by the landowner on their holdings when the tenancy has determined soon after the improvement has been effected. Yet in all these cases the duty of haulage has been considered in taking the farm and, in 99 cases out of a 100, it will be found that the tenant has had, without payment of interest or any increased rent whatsoever, the whole benefit of the landowner's expenditure. Let there be justice given to each side in the contract of tenancy ; no more is asked. And, from that point of view, the landowner has much ground for complaint under the present law. What is the equity, or the justice, or the idea of fairness underlying the rule that he may not proceed against the tenant under the Act for damage done to the farm by bad cultivation, neglect of fences, breach of agreement to keep buildings in repair, unless the tenant first proceeds against him for compensation for improvements ? Why, in the name of common honesty, does the law lay down—as is shown in the East Anglian case recently and correctly decided by the Court of Appeal—that the landowner's counterclaim can only be taken in *reduction* of the tenant's claim and may not exceed it ? Why should not man and man be equal before a Court of Law ? It must be confessed that the answer to these questions is beyond our comprehension, that it passes the wit of man.

By all means then let the Agricultural Holdings Act be amended in consonance with the principles of justice. So amended it will do away with every grievance which English or Welsh tenant can allege, and will do away with the possibility of them. But, be it remembered, you cannot enforce an adequate system of compensation and make the landowner pay it (that is to say if any regard be paid to equity), and *at the same time* compel the landowner to let the holding on which the compensation has been paid at an annual price fixed by an external authority on an un-

known principle. If you compel a man to buy a thing, the least you can do is to leave to him the right of disposing of the thing he has bought under compulsion, at the best price he can obtain.

And now the end of the task is almost reached, yet before summing up in a brief passage the case which, it will be submitted with confidence, has been made out successfully on behalf of Welsh landowners and the better class of Welsh tenants, there remain yet two more points, short but important, to which attention must be directed. The first of these is very simple. In the syllabus of the Royal Commission will be found a question suggesting that the rent of small holdings is higher, by the acre, than the rent of large farms. Of course it is, since the house and buildings of a small farm are necessarily more expensive in proportion than the house and buildings of a large farm. In fact, it is quite as true of the small farms as of the large, and it is certainly true of the large, that the rent paid by the tenant represents but a moderate interest upon the landowner's property on a farm let alone his property in the soil. (See on this point the evidence of Colonel H. R. Hughes.) In truth, from a merely commercial point of view, the only question is whether the investment of money in the purchase of land, or the investment of money in the improvement of land, is the poorer. But Welsh landowners, as a body, have never yet regarded land from the commercial point of view; they acknowledge that under the existing system the ownership of land carries with it certain privileges (greatly curtailed of late), which involve certain corresponding responsibilities. But they protest most earnestly that the removal of those privileges implies the abolition of the responsibilities.

Another point has to be mentioned. In the very valuable table of abatements and reductions to be found in the Appendix will be found the record of much generosity shown by landowners to the tenantry at large in the form of per-

manent reductions and temporary abatements. Of the various rules of caution which must be borne in mind by every man who is good enough to make these dry bones of figures live, by reflecting upon their true meaning, some indication has already been given. There is yet another warning, however, which must be given. It will be found that divers of the Commissioners insisted from time to time that, from the tenant's point of view, permanent reductions are greatly to be preferred to temporary abatements, and that may be the case. *Contra*, it must be remembered that while, in the first place, every man naturally shrinks from admitting, by permanent reductions all round, an enduring diminution of the value of his estate, there is to be found in the evidence a strong case for abatements as against reductions of rent. The plain fact of the matter is that the depression in agriculture in Wales has been wholly different in character from the depression in the wheat-growing counties of England. In England, notably in Essex and in Cambridgeshire, there are vast tracts of land which will grow practically nothing but wheat. By "arable land" there they mean land which must be ploughed and sown with wheat or lie idle and unproductive. As to too much of that land it has been found less ruinous to leave it untilled and sterile than to cultivate it at a loss. Consequently depression has been continuous and increasing. Of such land in Wales, or at any rate in North Wales, there is practically none, and it has been made abundantly clear that the fortunes of farmers depend mainly on the prices of stock and dairy produce. That the stock might be better bred with advantage, that the dairy produce might be brought to market in better condition, and that infinite trouble has been taken to instruct the tenantry on these points, is clear. Meanwhile it is also clear that, even during the time of depression, there have been several fluctuations of prices of a substantial character, and that distress has been neither

continuous nor steadily increasing. Now for fluctuating distress varying abatements are the best remedy. The evidence as to fluctuations differed, as was but natural, in different parts of the country; the fluctuations had been more acute in one district than another, and they had taken place at different times in different places. The evidence also is hardly as complete as it ought to be, simply because the whole of it—important as the question was—was left by the Commissioners to be extracted by written interrogatories administered by the representative of the North Wales Property Defence Association; but there is more than enough of it to show that it is dangerous in the last degree to apply cast-iron rules to the varying circumstances of diverse districts.

One small point more. It was suggested in another question in the official syllabus that farmers could not pay their rents if they paid wages to their children. Such has never been the custom in Wales, is never likely to be the custom in a country where the mass of the farmers belong to the peasant class and are not in the same large way of business as the majority of English farmers. But the evidence to show that the sons of small farmers are well started in the world in business, either as farmers or as tradesmen, or very often as professional men, was very strong. Indeed Mr. Price of Rhiwlas himself is entitled to boast that his estate has produced in Mr. Thomas Ellis, a farmer's son who has done pretty well in life so far, and, in giving other instances of less brilliance but of substantial value on his estate, Mr. Price was far from standing alone.

What then may the opponents of a Land Court claim to have established before a Royal Commission of which the majority were strikingly and undisguisedly hostile? They claim first to have disproved conclusively the allegation that differences of language, religion or politics have any practical influence on the relation of landowner and tenant in

Wales, since to go back to political evictions in 1859, evictions greatly to be regretted and by no means peculiar to Wales, is illogical. Parliament has provided a remedy for that grievance, and the remedy has been absolutely effectual. Two notices to quit, and two only, for refusal to pay tithe-rent-charge, they admit; but they point out that in both these cases the landowner was influenced by the consideration that the tithe-owner had, in the last resource, his remedy against the land itself; and they may add that, in some cases, that remedy was taken during the period of the tithe agitation. (The writer was present in Anglesey on an occasion when this took place.) They may add that, since the recent Tithe Act, the possibility of the recurrence of that grievance, if grievance it be, has been put an end to. As for alleged favouritism of Churchmen as compared with Nonconformists, that is an allegation which has been entirely disproved. They have also proved that the Welsh land question has no real existence, that the appearance of its vitality on paper has been created by factitious methods, that its would-be creators confessed themselves beaten over and over again, and that a vast body of Welsh farmers are wholly out of sympathy with agitation.

So much for the circumstances alleged to be peculiar to Wales; the averments have been proved to be flimsy, unsubstantial, unsupported by credible evidence. For the rest landowners claim in so many words to have placed themselves before the public in the position, which they have always occupied in fact, of perfect equality with their English brethren. More they by no means wish to claim; with nothing less will they be content. Whatsoever imperfections may exist in the law of compensation, are equally mischievous in England and Wales, since the law in the two countries is identical. Whatsoever amendments are made in that law must in common justice be made in both divisions of the country simultaneously. And such amendments, if they may

be made in a spirit of wisdom and of strict justice to either party, must of necessity do away with every grievance other than sentimental which can possibly arise. The "*ultima ratio* of eviction," to use the fervidly pedantic phrase of Mr. Ellis, can have no practical terrors for the tenant who knows he will receive adequate compensation for any value he has added to his land by his expenditure; and the knowledge that a tenant can give notice to quit, and extract a substantial sum from him if he attempts to raise the rent unduly, will be a sufficient check on any landowner. In the matter of generosity in meeting hard times, Welsh landowners claim to have shown themselves at least equal to their English brethren, so far as the necessities of various districts in England and Wales respectively go. Further they claim that it is no less true in Wales than in England that the rent represents but a moderate rate of interest on the capital moneys invested by the owner in buildings, houses, drainage, fences and a score of things besides, to say nothing of the original purchase price of the land itself. From the case of Ireland, or the supposed case of Ireland—for Irish landowners have shown since their property was confiscated that they might have made a far stronger case—and from that of the Crofting areas of Scotland, the case of Wales is absolutely distinguished. It is in fact identical with that of England.

And what of the reactionary system, involving a compulsory fixing of rents in the last resort at any rate, which it is proposed to substitute for that system of free contract which is the fruit of centuries of advancing civilisation? Firstly, it is in principle, since it can be nothing else, similar to that which prevails in Ireland and in Scotland, and to the necessity for tinkering at which the attention of Parliament is called continually. This fact alone should give pause to the advocates of innovation, should serve to impress upon them the abiding truth that every legislative enactment which attempts to fly in the face of economic principle is foredoomed to failure.

Well-established laws of economy are not like Copyright Acts or Bills of Sale Acts which may be passed to-day and repealed to-morrow. They are eternal, immutable, invariable, and their operation is no more capable of being affected by statute than was the advancing tide by Canute's command. BUT IF PARLIAMENT, BY ATTEMPTING TO CHECK THE OPERATION OF ECONOMIC LAWS, CAN DO NO GOOD, IT CAN NONE THE LESS DO AN INFINITY OF HARM, AND THAT IT HAS DONE, AS WE HAVE SHOWN IN OUTLINE AND MIGHT EASILY SHOW IN ELABORATE DETAIL, IN IRELAND. IT CAN ALIENATE LANDOWNER FROM TENANT, IT CAN TURN A LANDOWNER INTO AN IMPOVERISHED RENT-CHARGER, IT CAN SEND THE OUTGOING TENANT TO THE MARKET WITH HIS STOLEN PROPERTY, IT CAN RENDER IT ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE THAT THE INCOMING TENANT SHOULD PAY, BETWEEN JUDICIAL RENT AND INTEREST ON BORROWED MONEY, A FARTHING LESS THAN THE COMPETITION RENT. Finally, if this great evil, for evil it is scientifically certain that it must be, is to be brought about in Wales on the basis of reckless allegations founded upon the flimsiest of evidence, where there was any evidence at all, it will be brought about in England also. The Welsh landowners have, at the cost of infinite trouble and at great expense, borne the brunt of the battle. Their fate, however, will be shared, sooner rather than later, by English landowners also; whatsoever mischievous legislation is applied to Wales will be applied to England; English tenants will not submit if Welsh tenants are bribed—for a Land Court means tenant-right, and tenant-right conferred by statute is unblushing bribery—to being left in the cold. An urgent appeal is therefore addressed to Parliament, to all persons interested in English land and to all persons who love equity, and that appeal is for nothing more than common justice and for careful consideration of a remarkably strong case established in the face of the greatest possible difficulties. Nor must it be assumed that the appeal is urged prematurely. There will be no second Welsh Land

Commission, for the first has failed so ignominiously that a Conservative Government may feel that the case for the agitators has collapsed, and a Radical Government dare not venture on a second test of the kind. But the Conservative Government will not, in the nature of things, last for ever; and when "the pendulum swings," the Radicals will surely attempt to act upon the majority report as though it were inspired. The evidence, the constitution of the Commission, its methods of inquiry, the reckless assertions which led to its being called into existence—all these things will be forgotten; and that is why attention must be directed to them now.



APPENDIX I.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. GLADSTONE, &c.

(From *The Times*, October 12th, 1892.)

MR. GLADSTONE ON RENTS IN WALES.

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Times*.

SIR,—The serious charge laid against the landowners of the Principality by Mr. Gladstone in his recent speech at the foot of Snowdon has no doubt been brought to your notice. The North Wales Property Defence Association, which numbers amongst its members the great majority of considerable landowners in North Wales, is preparing a complete and exhaustive answer to Mr. Gladstone's accusation, and I am confident that the result will be entirely satisfactory. Of that confidence, indeed, this Association had given earnest long before Mr. Gladstone's speech was uttered, by pressing upon the late Government for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the question known as the Welsh Land Question, which is to all intents and purposes the creation of the Welsh vernacular Press. A moment's reflection shows that such an answer as is contemplated cannot be published at once, and subsequent events have tended to delay it. Thus Mr. Glad-

stone specified two sources of information, and two only. They were :—

(1) The speech of Mr. T. Ellis, M.P., in supporting the second reading of the Welsh Land Bill. It is hardly necessary to point out that the assertions made in the speech of a pronounced partisan ought not to have been accepted as gospel by the Prime Minister, and it may be said at once that there is no difficulty in showing, by virtue of serious allegations without any foundation in fact made in that speech by Mr. Ellis, that his statements are not always accurate.

(2) "Public and authentic returns." Now, the members of this Association, being of the opinion lately expressed by the Duke of Argyll that there are no "public and authentic" returns from which the actual rents paid by farmers in Wales can be gathered with accuracy, took the step of writing through me to Mr. Gladstone and to Mr. Ellis asking what these "public and authentic returns" might be. From Mr. Ellis no answer has been received. Mr. Gladstone, however, is always courteous, but there is a certain vagueness and ambiguity in his courteous replies. I append a copy of the correspondence, from which it will appear that there has been some difficulty in ascertaining what the precise returns were upon which Mr. Gladstone relied, and that Mr. Gladstone's memory failed him at a convenient moment.

"The North Wales Property Defence Association,

"Offices, 23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Sept. 16, 1892.

"To the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.

"RIGHT HON. SIR,—On behalf of the landowners of North Wales who belong to the above Association, I appeal to you to favour me with the authority upon which you founded your remarks as to the reduction of agricultural rents in England and Wales, in a speech which you delivered at Cwmllan on

Tuesday last, a cutting of which I enclose, taken out of to-day's *Carnarvon and Denbigh Herald*.

"Hoping you will favour me with an early reply,

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"GEO. H. M. OWEN."

Not receiving a reply, I wired to Mr. Gladstone's private secretary at Hawarden Castle on September 20, thus :—

"Would you kindly let me know if you have forwarded my letter of the 16th inst. to Mr. Gladstone?"

Reply received same day :—

"All letters forwarded at once to Downing Street."

"10 Downing Street, Whitehall, Sept. 20, 1892.

"SIR,—I am desired by Mr. Gladstone to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th inst., and to inform you that the figures on which he based his recent statement with regard to the reduction of rents in Wales were obtained from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"SPENCER LYTTTELTON.

"G. H. M. Owen, Esq."

"The North Wales Property Defence Association,

"Offices, 23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Sept. 27, 1892.

"To the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.

"RIGHT HON. SIR,—You will, I trust, pardon my addressing to you one additional question in relation to your recent utterances upon the Welsh land question. In the *Carnarvon and Denbigh Herald* (September 26) you are reported to have said :—

"'In Wales there were actually four counties in which during that period of distress the rents, so far from being reduced 24 per cent., so far from being reduced 7 per cent. even, were actually raised.'

"One of those counties, Carnarvon, you specify by name. Now my Association, which covers North Wales, and North Wales only, is, I venture to say, properly desirous of making answer, on behalf of landowners in North Wales, to the observations you have felt it your duty to make. I therefore venture to ask you either to specify by name the three counties left unnamed, or—and this will be quite sufficient for my purpose—to say that the said three counties are not in North Wales.

"I am, Right Hon. Sir, your obedient servant,

"GEO. H. M. OWEN."

"10 Downing Street, Whitehall, Sept. 29, 1892.

"SIR,—I am desired by Mr. Gladstone to acknowledge the receipt of your letter with regard to the counties in Wales where rents have been raised. He would rather not trust his memory, and would advise your asking for the figures. If you will tell him what you would wish he will see whether they can be given.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"SPENCER LYTTTELTON.

"G. H. M. Owen, Esq."

"The North Wales Property Defence Association,

"Offices, 23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Sept. 30, 1892.

"SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of yesterday, *re* my letter to Mr. Gladstone asking him to kindly name the four counties in Wales in which rents had increased.

"As suggested in your letter, I now make a respectful request that he will favour me with the loan of the document from which he quoted the figures, in order that I might make a copy of it, or would you supply me with a copy? I should be exceedingly obliged for an early reply.

"I am, sir, yours truly,

"GEO. H. M. OWEN.

"Spencer Lyttelton, Esq."

"The North Wales Property Defence Association,
 "Offices, 23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Oct. 7, 1892.

"SIR,—I beg to appeal to you for a reply to my letter of the 30th ult., in which I ask for a copy of the figures on which Mr. Gladstone based his authority in a speech at Cwmllan respecting Welsh landowners. I trust that you can favour me with the same at your earliest convenience.

"Yours truly,

"GEO. H. M. OWEN.

"Spencer Lyttelton, Esq."

"The North Wales Property Defence Association,
 "Offices, 23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Oct. 7, 1892.

"RIGHT HON. SIR,—On the 29th ult. I received a letter from Mr. Spencer Lyttelton informing me that he had been desired by you to acknowledge receipt of my letter with regard to the counties in North Wales where rents had been raised. He stated that you would rather not trust to your memory, and advised me to ask for the figures, and that if I informed you what I wished for, you would see whether the same could be given.

"On the 30th ult. I wrote back to Mr. Spencer Lyttelton direct (as I thought it would put you to less inconvenience if I communicated with him rather than with you), and, as he suggested, I made a respectful request in that letter to be favoured with the loan of the document from which you had quoted the figures in your speech at Cwmllan respecting rents in Wales; or, if that was not possible, if he would grant me a copy of the same. To this letter I have had no reply, so I thought it best to communicate direct with you with the hope that the information asked for would be kindly furnished.

"I have the honour to be, Right Hon. Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"GEO. H. M. OWEN.

"To the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P."

No reply has yet been received.

Without entering upon the whole question in any detail, I deem it sufficient to say for the present that the income-tax returns under Schedules A and B do not, for many reasons, afford anything like an adequate guide to the state of the agricultural rental, and I deem it my duty to ask you to make public the fact that, as soon as practicable, a full answer to Mr. Gladstone's charge will be published by this Association. The basis of that answer will be returns given under the hands of the vast majority of the landowners of North Wales.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

GEO. H. M. OWEN,

Secretary North Wales Property Defence Association.

Carnarvon, Oct. 10.

(From *The Times*, Wednesday, October 26th, 1892.)

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Times*.

SIR,—I submit to you for publication, if you are so disposed, the following letter from Mr. Gladstone's secretary, received on October 18:

"10 Downing Street, Whitehall, Oct. 17, 1892.

"Sir,—Referring to my letter of the 12th instant, I am desired by Mr. Gladstone to express his regret that, though further search has been made, he is still unable to find the figures which were supplied to him some time back by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and which he had in his mind when speaking at Cwmllan last month.

"He had not the figures with him at the time, and he was speaking from memory; but his recollection is clear that they showed that between two particular years Welsh rents had not fallen more than 7 per cent., and that in four counties they had actually risen.

"He has now been furnished with a return, which I enclose,

showing for the years from 1876-7 to 1890-91 inclusive (the period covered by the last number of the Statistical Abstract) the value of the lands assessed for income-tax (Schedule A) in England and in Wales, with the figures for each county separately in the case of the latter country.

“These figures do not tally precisely with those which Mr. Gladstone quoted in Wales, and which may have been derived from other sources or have related to different years; but the general result is not materially altered.

“The point on which he was laying stress in his speech was the aggregate reduction of rent in Wales as compared with England; and these figures show that between 1876-7 and 1890-91 there was a reduction in England of about 21 per cent., and in Wales of about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

“In stating the reduction at 24 per cent. in one case and 7 per cent. in the other, Mr. Gladstone was therefore rather understating the case, as it now appears that the reduction in Wales was about one-fifth of that in England instead of between one-third and one-fourth.

“He regrets that the result of the further inquiry which he has now instituted should be to exhibit the case of Wales in a form slightly more unsatisfactory than that which he had previously made public, and he will be very glad if any authentic arguments can be adduced to give it a more favourable aspect.

“He is, of course, aware that the income-tax figures do not exhibit the whole case, and especially that they do not take into account the important class of cases in which fresh outlay of landlords' capital without return has stood in place of reduction of rent. But his purpose was to compare Wales with England; and there is no reason to suppose that from this point of view the income-tax returns give less accurate results in the one case than in the other.

“With respect to the Welsh counties in which an actual increase has taken place, it is true that the returns now given

show only three counties in this position (namely, Anglesey, Carnarvon, and Carmarthen) instead of four. Mr. Gladstone thinks that the fourth county to which he was referring was probably Cardigan, as though between 1876-7 and 1890-91 it shows a slight reduction, it will be observed that this reduction took place in the last three years only, and that from 1879-80 to 1887-88 inclusive there was an increase.

“I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

“GEO. H. MURRAY.

“G. H. M. Owen, Esq.”

(Copy of Return enclosed.)

INCOME TAX.—SCHEDULE A.

ANNUAL VALUE OF LANDS ASSESSED IN EACH COUNTY OF WALES FOR THE YEARS 1876-7 TO 1890-1 RESPECTIVELY.

County.	1876-7.	1877-8.	1878-9.	1879-80.	1880-1.	1881-2.	1882-3.	1883-4.
Anglesey	£ 188,202	£ 179,848	£ 179,529	£ 194,233	£ 192,026	£ 190,853	£ 191,744	£ 189,185
Brecon	211,118	209,305	208,191	219,457	216,794	216,337	214,307	211,178
Cardigan	231,514	231,318	231,098	235,096	235,844	232,641	235,497	233,596
Carmarthen	406,579	406,619	406,632	419,820	418,424	417,500	418,450	414,777
Carnarvon	208,632	205,038	203,962	212,562	210,306	209,500	212,689	210,274
Denbigh	383,677	374,896	373,180	379,556	377,994	375,809	367,429	362,941
Flint	232,496	229,565	228,906	221,506	220,786	219,591	227,431	223,754
Glamorgan	343,802	344,064	336,783	340,395	340,414	333,835	344,152	341,013
Merioneth	145,889	145,309	144,873	148,157	147,989	145,737	148,631	147,138
Montgomery	344,114	341,172	340,530	343,631	343,374	342,522	341,070	339,022
Pembroke	359,610	358,664	358,457	366,806	366,639	366,361	373,738	371,318
Radnor	178,953	178,332	178,511	184,391	183,363	182,150	176,344	174,739
Total for Wales.	3,221,896	3,204,030	3,191,652	3,265,610	3,253,958	3,238,856	3,251,482	3,218,885
Total for England	48,589,338	48,518,264	48,466,029	48,533,340	48,345,470	47,943,372	48,151,433	44,735,949

(Copy of Return enclosed.)

INCOME TAX.—SCHEDULE A. (*continued*).

ANNUAL VALUE OF LANDS ASSESSED IN EACH COUNTY OF WALES FOR THE YEARS 1876-7 TO 1890-1 RESPECTIVELY.

County.	1884-5.	1885-6.	1886-7.	1887-8.	1888-9.	1889-90.	1890-1.
Anglesey	£ 188,202	£ 189,862	£ 188,522	£ 187,527	£ 187,419	£ 185,866	£ 185,245
Brecon	209,616	206,246	203,418	200,390	196,155	194,389	193,662
Cardigan	232,879	235,502	231,482	232,232	229,285	227,518	226,081
Carmarthen	416,830	433,088	430,345	429,181	427,993	427,378	424,716
Carmarvon	208,663	216,900	214,959	213,179	216,442	214,977	214,120
Denbigh	361,123	352,811	348,975	343,881	334,839	331,369	327,584
Flint	221,798	221,722	219,985	217,689	210,300	208,439	207,315
Glamorgan	338,541	336,804	334,518	330,232	327,586	324,321	323,208
Merioneth	146,561	146,174	145,075	144,180	142,422	141,318	140,578
Montgomery	337,853	335,261	333,631	329,210	321,152	319,560	318,098
Pembroke	371,030	362,127	358,550	356,249	357,046	353,014	351,428
Radnor	173,724	169,654	167,888	165,223	161,034	160,123	158,987
Total for Wales	3,206,820	3,206,151	3,180,348	3,149,173	3,111,673	3,088,772	3,071,025
Total for England	44,387,358	42,787,394	42,195,415	41,322,669	39,162,771	38,706,822	38,307,564

It would be unjust to expect any journal to afford me the space which would be necessary for a complete exposure of the fallacies which vitiate Mr. Gladstone's argument that these particular returns show the rise and fall of the agricultural rental. These will be dealt with in the statement of the case to be published shortly by my Association; but it may be well to call attention in rough outline to some of the points of weakness.

In his Snowdon speech Mr. Gladstone said that he had learnt with astonishment, partly from him (*i.e.*, Mr. T. E. Ellis) and partly from the investigation of "public and authentic returns," some things which caused him "both surprise and pain," and among these things was the fact, stated by him in terms far more direct and unequivocal than is customary with him, that the reduction of agricultural rents in England and Wales combined had been 24 per cent., while in Wales alone it had been only 7 per cent., and in four counties there had been an increase. We now learn that the "public and authentic returns" consisted of an extract from the returns in the possession of the Inland Revenue Department made expressly for Mr. Gladstone—that is to say, the returns were "authentic" certainly in the sense that they were made under the hands of landowners, and they were so far public that they were made for public purposes; but they have not until this moment been made accessible to the public. I am at a loss to understand why Mr. Gladstone should not at the outset have explained what the character of these returns was.

Welsh landowners have been taunted on the ground that there "is a flutter in their camp" because they have taken Mr. Gladstone's words seriously. It is to my mind curious and even entertaining that Mr. Gladstone's admirers should suggest that a very definite threat uttered by the Prime Minister of the kingdom ought to be treated with contempt, and I make no apology for submitting it to close examination.

To be in possession of Mr. Gladstone's source of information is to have the ground clear, and enables me to place the main outline of our defence before the public.

It is admitted that if the returns under Schedule A showed the agricultural rental, they would justify, so far as mere statistics go, Mr. Gladstone's accusation, but it is submitted that Schedule A does not, either in its entirety or in the part used by Mr. Gladstone, show the agricultural rental. Mr. Gladstone himself admits that the figures "do not take into account the important class of cases in which fresh outlay of landlord's capital without return has stood in place of reductions of rent," but, he says in effect, neither do they take into account such outlay in England. His argument is, therefore, "Assume two unknown factors to be equal, and the result is disadvantageous to the Welsh landowners." I venture to say that the assumption is absolutely unwarranted, and to guarantee to prove from my sources of information that the practice of making, at their own cost, improvements and repairs which stand on the border line of improvements is almost universal among Welsh landowners, and that the expenditure under this head has been enormous. But this is not the only fallacy. If the answers, covering many hundreds of thousands of acres in North Wales, which I have received up to the date may be taken as a sample, they will prove to the satisfaction of Mr. Gladstone and all reasonable men that over something like four-fifths of the acreage of North Wales temporary abatements of rent varying from 33 to 5 per cent. have been made during periods of depression. Of these temporary abatements, being remissions of money due and in the nature of voluntary presents, the gross income-tax returns cannot make any account.

I think—but upon this I speak with reserve—that I can show Mr. Gladstone that the apparent incomes of landowners from rents have been swollen, in some cases before the recent

Tithe Act, and in some since, by the fact that landowners paid the tithe rent-charge to the titheowners, collected the tithe rent-charge from occupiers as part of the rent, and returned their gross annual incomes as rent *plus* tithe rent-charge. There has been a great variety of practice in this matter.

Also I venture to point out that there has, as Mr. Gladstone pointed out in his recent speech, been a great growth of urban communities of late, with the result that many farms which were outlying have become accommodation land of great value.

These are the main objections to Mr. Gladstone's arithmetical contention, but there remains the most serious objection, which is that arithmetic is no guide in a question of this character. Mr. Gladstone, desirous for the moment of distinguishing English from Welsh landowners, and of flattering the first-named class, harped upon the consideration of English landowners, and throughout his speech argued as though English and Welsh rents had risen and fallen from the same plane during the period of comparison. Without desiring to say anything harsh of English landowners, I submit that the deplorable reduction in their incomes from land, so far as that can be taken from Schedule A, is not entirely due to consideration on their part. Thus, from 1876 to 1890 the annual value of land in Essex fell from £1,785,687 to £1,181,069, in Lincolnshire from £3,155,075 to £2,300,512, in Norfolk from £2,127,840 to £1,617,501, and there are other wheat-growing counties in an equally deplorable condition; but if the cases of counties of more or less analogous character to Wales are taken—that is to say, the cases, for example, of Cheshire, Monmouth, Cornwall, Westmoreland and Devon, it will be found that the rise and fall in annual value has been much the same as in Wales. In Norfolk, Essex, Lincoln and other like counties landowners have

suffered in income simply and solely because their land will grow next to nothing but wheat, and wheat will not, it appears, pay the cost of production. The fact is that, so far as England, as a whole, can be compared with Wales, as a whole, England is essentially a wheat-growing country, and Wales is essentially a pastoral and stock-raising country. This being the case, Mr. Gladstone may choose his own period of comparison. Mr. Ellis chose to begin early in the century, when wheat was at famine prices; Mr. Gladstone chooses to begin in 1876. Now, the average price of English farmers' staple product has fallen steadily since 1812, and the average price of stock, low as that price is at the present moment, and although it has been subject to fluctuations, is still 50 per cent. higher than it was at the beginning of the century. Far be it from me to make light of the present depression of the prices of farm produce in Wales; it is deep and deplorable; it has been met, and will be met, by generous abatements on the part of landowners; but while that depression is admitted, it must be remembered that in the course of the fifteen years (1876-1891) over which Mr. Gladstone ranges there have been periods of inflated prosperity for the mass of Welsh farmers, and periods of normal character, as well as periods of depression. In other words, the Welsh farmer contends, for the most part, against temporary and climatic forces, while the English farmer wages a hopeless battle against a permanent and economical force. For these reasons it is urged that it is unjust of Mr. Gladstone to compare Welsh landowners with their English brethren, and to base a purely arithmetical argument upon rents which he does not know with precision, which did not start from the same plane, which have been surrounded in their rise and fall by totally different conditions.

Our reply will deal with the whole question comprehensively, will meet point by point, not only Mr. Gladstone's general indictment, but also the allegation of specific griev-

ances made by Mr. Ellis, and will set up as completely as possible the constructive case for the landowners.

Yours, &c.,

GEO. H. M. OWEN,

Secretary North Wales Property Defence Association.

23 Market Street, Carnarvon, Oct. 24.

(From *The Times*, January 9th, 1893.)

MR. GLADSTONE, MR. ELLIS AND WELSH RENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Times*.

SIR,—It may be a matter of surprise to some of your readers that the leading landowners of Wales (at least North Wales) have not issued some further statement traversing and refuting the charges made against them by Mr. Gladstone in what is known as his Snowdon speech; but, having the object lesson of the Morley Commission before their eyes, and with the prospect of a Commission being appointed in Wales, they have come to the conclusion that the proper course for them to pursue is to content themselves for the present with meeting Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Ellis on their own ground. When fresh arguments are used they will know how to deal with them. I will proceed, therefore, without in any way retiring from the assertion that Mr. Gladstone has missed the true standard of comparison between Welsh and English agriculture, to set forth the various grounds upon which Mr. Gladstone's figures and some of the statements made by Mr. Ellis are not only delusive, but also incorrect, and to show conclusively that the best information in the hands of the Inland Revenue Department affords no means of ascertaining the position of Welsh rentals or of following their rise and fall.

Mr. Gladstone acknowledges two sources of information, and two only; the first is Mr. T. E. Ellis, and the second the

special return for "Lands, &c.," for Wales county by county, and for England. I will deal with the sources *seriatim*. Commencing with Mr. Ellis, I submit that there is not much difficulty about showing that a statement made by that gentleman may be of little value as regards accuracy unless it be corroborated; and as an instance of that gentleman's tendency to occasional digression from fact (without imputing deliberate untruthfulness to him) I will reproduce two versions of a statement made by Mr. T. E. Ellis in that House of Commons speech upon which Mr. Gladstone relied for authentic information concerning landowners in Wales:—

The Times, March 17.

"Much discontent had been caused in Wales by the enclosure of what had formerly been pasture land. In one case Lord Penrhyn had enclosed some pasture land, and the fences had been broken down, upon which Lord Penrhyn had used his power as chairman of quarter sessions to obtain a special posse of police to protect the fences, and had levied a special rate in the district to bring these farmers to their senses."

Parliamentary Debates (purporting to be revised by Mr. Ellis).

"In regard to the question of pasturage, too, the rights of the people had been invaded. In his evidence Lord Penrhyn admitted that considerable difficulty had arisen in his district owing to the fact that the pasturage of the tenants had been enclosed. In the assertion of their rights, the tenants had taken down the fences; and what did Lord Penrhyn do? He used his power, as chairman of quarter sessions, if I remember rightly, to obtain a special posse of police for the district, and he levied a special rate to bring to submission these farmers who had asserted their rights."

The plain facts and real truth were as follows :—The enclosures alluded to were not made by or at the instigation of the late Lord Penrhyn (against whom the attack of Mr. Ellis was aimed). The application for the enclosures came from various landowners, of whom Lord Penrhyn was not one, he having no property in that district at the time of the application. The award for the enclosures was made under Act of Parliament, after being nine years under consideration. The application for police protection was made by the various landowners affected, and not by Lord Penrhyn alone. The pulling down of the enclosures was suspected to be the work of persons many of whom had no right to the pasturage, but were merely influenced by dislike of law and order. Lastly, Lord Penrhyn never was chairman of quarter sessions. When a comparison is made between the facts of the case and the statement of Mr. Ellis the difference is certainly of a striking and suggestive character.

Passing to the argument upon returns, Mr. Ellis relies upon Schedule B as a precise index of agricultural rental; indeed, he takes the returns under Schedule B from year to year as precise evidence on the rise and fall of rents in England and Wales. I call his attention to the following :

(1) The return for “Lands, &c.,” under Schedule A, from which Mr. Gladstone obtained a special extract, covers, as will be shown later, far more ground than the purely agricultural rental, but the returns under Schedule B (as cited by Mr. Ellis from income-tax paper No. 39) for the year 1889-90 for England and Wales, that being the last year quoted by Mr. Gladstone, actually exceed in amount the returns for “Lands, &c.,” under Schedule A according to Mr. Gladstone’s extract.

(2) Under Schedule B were included in the same year lands within the metropolitan area of the gross annual value of £84,373, from which it follows clearly that Schedule B covers much more than the purely farming rental, for there

is little, if any, pure agriculture within the metropolitan area.

I will also ask Mr. Ellis to explain why, if "Schedule B represents the agricultural rental," Mr. Gladstone, who is an authority in financial matters, should have thought it worth while, when he desired to inquire into the agricultural rental, to have a special extract made from the returns under Schedule A. Was it not because Mr. Gladstone knew that Schedule B was delusive?

With regard to Mr. Gladstone's figures I am obliged to point out in addition to my arguments published previously that, for the variety of reasons, general and local, the extract from the returns under Schedule A cannot represent, even roughly, the agricultural rental. A sum in addition shows that the totals for 1890-91 given by Mr. Gladstone for Wales and England amount to precisely the sum given in the 35th Annual Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inland Revenue (1892) under the heading "Lands, &c." for England, including Wales; and "Lands, &c.," represents the extreme limits of the information which the Inland Revenue could give to Mr. Gladstone. Now, under "Lands &c.," a great deal more than the annual agricultural value is included, although the annual value is not necessarily determined by the rent. Thus in 1890-91 "lands" were assessed at £90,926 in the metropolis, where agriculture exists practically only in the form of market gardens and accommodation land: in fact, every piece of land of more than an acre which, being the property of an individual or corporation, is not built upon, is assessed under "Lands, &c.," under Schedule A. Further, all houses not big enough to be liable to house duty and held in connection with more than an acre of land are assessed under "Lands" under Schedule A; or, at any rate, there is nothing to distinguish the houses in such cases from the "Lands."

Further, the fluctuations in value are explained by such

sentences as the following, extracted from the 23rd report:—
“The fluctuations in value are due to corrections in the assessment for the previous year. Moreover, it may be observed that, as land becomes built upon and appropriated to other uses, the value ceases to be classed under the heading ‘lands,’ and becomes chargeable as for ‘houses’ under Schedule A or profits under Schedule D.” The Commissioners of Inland Revenue have never asserted that the returns for “Lands, &c.,” represented the agricultural rental with any precision. Thus, in their report of 1883 (p. 41) they say:—“The decline in the valuation of lands above shown of £480,941 exhibits to a greater extent than any preceding year the depreciation in value of landed property, so far as the same can be judged by income-tax statistics solely.” Indeed, a study of the series of reports shows most clearly that the factors which go to make the figures are in a constant state of flux, and that the territorial extent of “Lands. &c.,” varies from year to year so greatly that it is quite impossible to trace the agricultural rental from the returns for “lands.” Further, the report of 1892, in reference to the gross disproportion between local valuation and income-tax assessments (a disproportion amounting to more than 40 per cent. in the extreme cases of Anglesey and Carnarvonshire), points out that many occupiers made false returns to the income-tax, not so much because they feared the income-tax as because they feared their rateable value might be increased, from which it follows that income-tax statistics, even if they purported to represent the farming rental, which they do not, would be untrustworthy, and particularly untrustworthy in the case of the counties named. Figures, in fact, must not be trusted for more than they are worth.

These are some of the general reasons for believing that the returns for “lands” must be subject to large and varying deductions of unknown quantity before the agricultural rental

can be ascertained. In truth, the returns for "lands" can only approach to a representation of the agricultural rental when we study the returns for survey districts in isolated agricultural localities. Towns upset the whole calculation. This I am able to do for the years 1876-77 to 1885-86, after which the survey districts, or some of them, were rearranged, so that comparison becomes difficult. I give the figures obtained from the Inland Revenue in relation to the county of Essex:

Survey.	1876-77.	1885-86.
Cambridge . . .	£109,345	£128,968
Chelmsford . . .	534,645	491,616
Colchester . . .	686,837	484,093
Hertford . . .	78,096	60,945
Stratford . . .	238,983	120,903
Tottenham (portion of) .	137,781	112,625
County of Essex .	£1,785,687	£1,399,150

These are figures of a very striking character, showing that, while the annual value of lands in the county fell by £386,537, the annual value of lands in that portion of the county of Essex which is included in the Cambridge survey district actually rose by all but £20,000. True, there may have been special local causes at Cambridge, but special local causes, which are numerous, go to make our point, which is that many varying factors go to make the aggregate figures.

Special reasons why the returns for Wales under "Lands, &c.," do not represent the agricultural rental are:

(1) That the holdings in Wales being notoriously smaller than those in England, the expenditure by owners on structural repairs is necessarily greater in Wales than in England.

(2) That the permanent depression in England has been met by permanent reductions, which diminish the return for

lands, while the return for Wales makes no account of the almost universal temporary abatements, which are far greater in proportion than in England.

(3) That the very large number of some-time tenants, especially in Carnarvon and Anglesey, who have bought their holdings, being exempt from income-tax, are indifferent to the figure at which their little properties stand in the income-tax books. Moreover, many of these purchases have been made under circumstances where it is not unreasonable to believe that the purchase-money was borrowed at a higher rate of interest than the land was likely to repay in the form of rent under existing agricultural conditions, and in those cases the assessors have very properly raised the assessment. For example, when a man has paid £1000 borrowed at 4 per cent. for property rented at £30 or less, the assessment has been raised to £40; and it is beyond dispute that in parts of North Wales the land has been assessed in this manner at a fictitious value, and the assessment cannot consequently serve as a sure guide to the agricultural value.

Finally, Mr. Gladstone, writing to Lord Sudeley, invited a comparison upon the basis of the returns for lands between Wales and England more or less like Wales. I have the materials for such a comparison, and invite Mr. Gladstone's attention to the following figures:

	Income Tax, Schedule A, 1876-77.	Annual Value of Lands Assessed, 1889-90.
Cheshire. . .	£1,185,575	£1,144,457
Cornwall . . .	930,002	902,556
Cumberland . . .	824,640	773,569
Westmoreland . . .	351,922	335,812
	3,292,139	3,156,394*
Wales	3,221,896	3,088,772†

* Decrease, £135,745.

† Decrease £137,124.

So that Wales fell in almost identical proportion with our English counties of a similar annual value at the outset. I do not, however, think that either of these falls represent the fall of agricultural rental, and I am inclined to think, when I remember my illustrations from Essex, that the agricultural rental has declined far more seriously, while the value of "lands" has been kept up, especially in Carnarvonshire and Anglesey, by the steady growth of small residential holdings round such places as Llandudno, Bangor, Carnarvon, Pwllheli, Criccieth, Menai Bridge, Beaumaris and Llangefni. In conclusion I venture to assert that to ascertain with any approach to accuracy the purely agricultural rental of North Wales, or of a single county in it, for a single year by the help of any existing statistics is a matter of impossibility. In the meantime, it is evident that, in taking figures which cannot be relied on for the basis of his accusations, Mr. Gladstone has shown injustice towards the landowners of Wales whom he has assailed.

Yours, &c.,

GEO. H. M. OWEN,

Secretary North Wales Property Defence Association.

Carnarvon, Jan. 3.

APPENDIX II.

The following are the figures and statements as to abatements, reductions and history of rental, obtained by the late Mr. George Owen, under the hands of the landowners and agents making the returns. None have been omitted:—

ANGLESEY.

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Major-General Hughes Llyn Valley, Anglesey	88 acres £120	None 1892, last half, 10 p.c.	None	Re-valuation has resulted in reduction
Mrs. Augusta Scott . Ailesbury Villa, Sydney Parade, Dublin	168 acres	1886-7, 10 p.c.; 1887-8, 10 p.c.; 1888-9, 10 p.c.; 1889-90, 10 p.c.; 1890-91, 10 p.c.; 1891- 92, 10 p.c.; 1893, 10 p.c.	£1 on one farm . .	Not owned 50 years

ANGLESEY—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 60 Years
<i>Anglesey</i> William Lloyd, Esq., Llan- brydyfrydog, Llan- clymedd <i>Anglesey</i>	270 acres . . . £280 Tithes in some instances paid by me and in- cluded in the rents	1888-90, 12 to 14 p.c. in manures, Mich. 1892, 5 to 12 p.c.	None (leascholds) . .	Some slight increase in 50 years
Sir R. H. Williams-Bul- keley, Bart., Baron Hill, Bea- maris <i>Anglesey</i> Carnarvon	24,777 acres . . . £14,630 about	1886, 12½ p.c.; 1887, 8½ p.c.; 1888, 5 p.c.; Mich. 1892, 10 p.c.	Several farms . .	Three re-valuations; rents raised
John Owen, Esq., Cacrau, Llanfalyng- hauwy Valley, Angle- sey <i>Anglesey</i>	101 acres . . . £176	1892, 5 p.c. . . .	None	None
Lord Stanley of Alderley, Penrhos, Holyhead	About 5600 acres . . . About £5000	Disapproved on principle .	1880, £25 . . . 1892, £10 . . .	No re-valuation this cen- tury. No rent raised to a permanent tenant

Anglesey	Warren Edward Evans, Esq. Henblas, Llangefni	570 acres about 300 acres let in small holdings to 28 tenants, all above two acres 165 acres grazing land let to above tenants of small holdings; one exception; and about 15 to 20 acres woodland	A. R. P.	Some previously to 1892, and Mich. 1892, 10 p.c. in nearly all cases except to leaseholders; again in Lady Day, 1893, rents, 10 p.c.; I have but few leaseholders. Temporary abatements allowed on grazing land as well as on small farms held at will	All except leaseholds. Pays all tithe rent-charge on land at will and in lease since November 1887. Permanent reductions allowed on grazing land as well as on small farms held at will	£ s. d. . 20 0 0 . 9 10 0 29 10 0	No rise of rent since I am in possession	Some rents raised and reduced again within 50 years. All tithes paid by owner, and not recovered from tenants
	Rev. Hugh Pritchard, Dinam, Gaerwen, Anglesey	Warren Farm . Acreage .	1496 2 0 75 2 0 1572 0 0	According to circumstances Michaëmas, 1892, 5 p.c.	Warren Farm .	. 20 0 0 . 9 10 0 29 10 0	No rise of rent since I am in possession	
	Anglesey	Warren Farm . Rent .	£ s. d. 184 0 0 57 0 0 241 0 0					
	Sir George Meyrick, Bart. Bodorgan, R.S.O.	16,560 acres £13,750	. . .	1883-84, 5 p.c.; 1885, 10 p.c.; 1886-87, 15 p.c.; 1888, 10 p.c.; 1889, 5 p.c.; 1890-91, 10 p.c.; 1892, 20 p.c.	None		Re-valuation in 1871; estate relet at 5 p.c. less than the re-valuation	
	Anglesey							
	Thomas Pritchard, Esq. Llywdarth Esrob, Llanerchymedd	161 acres £234, including two public-houses let with land, and accommodation land		1886-92, 5 p.c.; 1892, 10 p.c.	None		—	
	Anglesey							
	Mrs. Vaughan . . . The Deanery, Llandanff	670 acres £618		"Presents" when necessary	£37		No re-valuation and no increase of rent in 50 years	

ANGLESEY—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Anglesey The Hon. Lady Neave Llysduelas, Amlwch Anglesey	Acreage, 4500 Rental, £4000	1886, Lady-day, 15 p.c.; Michael- mas, 10 p.c.; 1887, Michael- mas, 15 p.c.; 1888, Lady-day, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas, 10 p.c.; 1889, Lady-day, 10 p.c.; MI- chaelmas, 10 p.c.; 1892, MI- chaelmas, 10 p.c.; 1893, Lady- day, 10 p.c.	—	—
Lady Vivian . . . Plysgwyn, Penrtrath Anglesey Flint	4000 acres	1886, 1887, 1888, 10 p.c.; Sep- tember 20th, 1892, to March 26th, 1893, 10 p.c.	On one farm £15 per annum	The rents show an in- crease of £154 7s. 10d. in the last 50 years, and a decrease of £36 6s., not increase £118 1s. 10d., caused by the falling in of two old leases in 1856 and 1859 by which there was an advance of £50 and £62 5s. 10d.

				Old. New. £ £	
Colonel T. L. Hampton Lewis	About 3000 acres		1887, 1888, 1889, about 10 p.c.; 1892, paid all tithes as at- tachment; rents due October 1892, received in February 1893; rents due April 1893, received August 1893; tithe added to rent, 10 p.c.; abate- ment on gross	Bodgyleld . 225 160 Piasrhydbont . 200 180 Bryn Bella . 120 105 Bryn . 130 115 Bryn Bach . 60 50 Tyson (13 acres from Capt. Verney, Ten- ant spent £180 on the buildings) . 17 12	No re-valuation in 50 years; no increase of rent on new farmhouses; increase on entirely new outbuildings
Anglesey				825 622	
Harry Clegg, Esq. Pias Llanfair, Llanfair, P.G.	838 acres £891		Small amounts only prior to 1892. Since, 10 p.c. on small farms and 15 p.c. on the large one	Bought in 1888-90 .	Bought recently
Anglesey					
Lord Boston Hedsor, Maldenhead	8300 acres £7500		1886, December 1887, June 1888, June 1890, December 1892; 10 p.c. each occasion	1888, 64 farms, £218 .	No general re-valuation. A rise, more than can- celled by reductions
Anglesey					
Rev. R. W. Richard . Stoke Vicarage, Chester	406 acres £464 15s.		10 p.c. in 1889, 1892, and 1893 .	One farm reduced from £150, with tithe (at par), to £135. In Carnarvon- shire 25 p.c.	Rents generally raised from what they were 50 years ago
Anglesey Carnarvon					
J. Rice Roberts, Esq. Tanygraig, Penrueh	1100 acres		Every half-year since Septem- ber 1885; 1892, last half, 10 p.c.	None	No general re-valuation, but rents raised in some instances

ANGLESEY—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), in giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Anglesey				
The Marquis of Anglesey. Pias Newydd, Llanfair, P.G.	9251 acres (including 422 in moiety with Lady Neave) £8599 11s. 3d.	The whole tithe allowed tenants "at will" without repayment since 1886	Several	Re-valuation in 1863 raised rental £800, which is more than cancelled by payment of tithes and other allowances
Anglesey				

CARNARVONSHIRE.

Lord Penrhyn . . . Penrhyn Castle, Bangor	72,000 acres . . . £21,411 exclusive of tithe	1885-89, 10 p.c.; 1892, 10 and 20 p.c. in various parts for first half-year; Michaelmas, 1892, 25 p.c., part of the estate, 30 p.c.; the rest; May 1893, 25 p.c.	£750 since 1883 . . .	Non-valuation in 50 years. A few rents raised for improvements made by owner, but this increase invariably remitted now
Carnarvon Denbigh				
Colonel T. E. J. Lloyd . Pias Tregayan, Llan- gwyllog	1700 acres . . . £1100 about	10 p.c. from 1886 until Lady- day, 1893	None	Re-valuation in 1877, in- crease about 10 p.c. No individual increases

Carnarvon Anglesey	J. W. Wyatt, Esq. East Court Wells, Somerset Carnarvon	490 acres £100 (including cottages)	.	.	.	None	.	No rents raised in 50 years
Rev. Philip Constable Ellis The Rectory, Llanfair-fochan Carnarvon	110 acres £152	.	.	.	.	None	.	Re-valued in 1874. Rents raised from that date 5 p.c. No prior increase since 1855
Llewelyn E. S. Parry, Esq. Stinsford House, Dorchester Carnarvon	4000 acres £337 1s. 3d.	.	.	.	.	.	.	No re-valuation or increase since 1876 with exception of one farm which was re-valued and subdivided in 1887. No data before 1876
Colonel R. Lloyd Williams Bodgwllyn, Denbigh Carnarvon	1008 acres £360	.	.	.	.	None	.	No re-valuation, but some increase on improvements
Rev. Daniel Vandrey Plasgwynant, Beddgelert Carnarvon	1500 acres	.	.	.	.	All 10 p.c., one 25 p.c.	.	No rents raised in 50 years
Archdeacon Lloyd Edgmond, Newport, Salop Carnarvon	754 acres £277 15s.	.	.	.	.	Since 1890 I have made a permanent reduction by undertaking the payment of tithe rent-charge without claim on the tenant	.	For more than 50 years the rent unchanged by rise or fall. I can find no change since 1829, to which year my accounts go back

CARNARVONSHIRE — (continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
S. Platt, Esq. Brynnneuadd, Llanfair- fechan Carnarvon	670 acres	1888, about 10 p.c. . . . 1889 " " " 1892 " " " 1893 " " "	Nearly all rents perma- nently reduced	Know of no rent increased within 50 years
Charles Frost, Esq. . . . Minydon, Old Colwyn Carnarvon	340 acres £300	1886-92, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 10 p.c.	None	No re-valuation; no in- crease of rent in 50 years
Rev. G. E. Ashley . . . Strutton Rectory, Here- ford Carnarvon Denbigh	1407 acres £746	10 p.c. usually, up to 1889. Rents of seven farms, Cerrigy- druidion, due September 29th, 1892, not received until March 25th, 1893, and 10 p.c. in addi- tion to the permanent reduc- tion in column 4 was allowed in some cases. Rents of 6 farms, Cerrigydruidion, March 25th, 1893, allowed 10 p.c. on all in addition to permanent reduction	1889, rent reduced from £488 plus tithe to £475 minus tithe which was £30	Re-valuation 1889 showed some reductions which were given, and some increases which were not taken

APPENDIX II.

273

G. W. Duff-Ashton Smith, Esq. Vaynol, near Bangor Carnarvon Anglesey	Area, 35,936 acres Rental, £25,148 9s. 4d. (including cottages and houses in towns, about £5000) 1802 tenants, including leaseholders and cot- tagers 439 acres £709	May 1886-89, 10 p.c.; 1892, 10 p.c. on rent and tithe rentcharge, November 1892, rents postponed till March 1893, and 25 p.c. allowed. May 1895, rents postponed to August and 25 p.c. allowed. Whole sum 1886-93 amounted to £20,589 20 p.c. one farm, 1892; 10 p.c. others, 1892; last half 10 p.c.	Eight farms permanently reduced	A valuation was made 23 years ago; result, 10 p.c. increase now more than cancelled by abatements. No other valuation within 70 years at least
Colonel Henry Platt Gordding, Llanfart- fechan Carnarvon Anglesey	220 acres	Michaelmas, 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1893, 10 p.c.	£20 on one farm	Has never raised a rent (a recent purchaser)
Lady Augusta Mostyn Gloddiaeth, Llandudno Carnarvon	522½ acres Average rent under £1 per acre	1886-88, 5 p.c.; 1892, 10 p.c.; 1892, last half, 20 p.c.; 1893, Lady-day, 20 p.c.	None	No re-valuation or increase of rent since they were purchased in 1873 and 1886
Major Owen Lloyd Jones Evans Broom Hall, Chwilog, R.S.O. Carnarvon	14,600 acres £3600	1886 to 1889 (half-year only), 10 p.c.; 1892, 15 p.c.; 1893, 20 p.c. (first half of year only), besides individual cases	Several, notably in cases of farms and cottages purchased. Reductions on 5 farms in 1892	A re-valuation with slight increase in 1871
Colonel C. A. Wynne Finch Voelas, Bettwsycod Carnarvon Denbigh	5073 acres	1886-88, 5 to 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1892, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 20 p.c.; Lady-day, 1893, 20 p.c.	None	No re-valuation, and very few rents raised in 50 years
Owen Evans, Esq. Broom Hall, Chwilog, R.S.O. Carnarvon		10 p.c. most years; 1892 (last half), 10 p.c.; 1893 (first half), 15 p.c.	None	Increase 30 years back
G. H. Owen, Esq. Ynwleth, Criceth				

CARNARVONSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Basis and fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Carnarvon Merioneth Hugh John Ellis Nanney, Esq. Gwynfryn, Cricieth Carnarvon Merioneth Montgomery	6447 acres, exclusive of accommodation lands and house property	1883, 10 p.c. on rents; 1887, the tithe paid for tenants; 1888, 10 p.c. on the rents, and 17½ p.c. on the tithes; 1889, 10 p.c. on the rent, which now in- cluded 80 p.c. of the tithe com- mutation; 1892-33, 12½ p.c. on the rent plus 80 p.c. of the tithe commutation	One farm which had been raised in 1876 from £40 to £45 now reduced to £39 16s. 6d.	I can only speak of my own knowledge of this estate for 20 to 21 years, and the increased rents amount to about 6 p.c. from a revaluation in 1876, when some farms were reduced and others raised. Some rents are still the same as they were as far back as memory goes
Rev. J. C. Williams-Ellis Glasfryn, Chwilog, R.S.O. Carnarvon Merioneth	2200 acres £1777	1886-88, 10 p.c.; 1892, 5 and 10 p.c.; 1893, 15 p.c., in one case more	£17 in 1893	No re-valuation or rent raised in 50 years (it is believed), but in farms bought in 1866, and on another bought not long after, sub-divisions and valuations were made and two new farmhouses erected

Mrs. Lloyd Trallwyn, Chwilog, R.S.O. Carnarvon Merioneth	1316 acres	Many times from 5 to 10 p.c.	2 farms	Re-valued; increase
Lord Harlech . . . Glyn, Talsarnau, and Brogrutyn, Oswestry	Merioneth and Carnarvon, about 15,600 acres. Rental, about £6040	Carnarvon and Merioneth:— Lady-day, 1886, 15 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1886, 10 p.c.; Lady-day and Michaelmas, 1887, 10 p.c.; Lady-day and Michaelmas, 1888 and 1889, 10 p.c. Part of Montgomeryshire as above, with 10 p.c. in 1890; 1892, 15 p.c.	Denbigh £111	In 50 years Carnarvon and Merioneth rents raised about 10 p.c.; others believed to be unaltered
Carnarvon Merioneth Montgomery Denbigh				
John Jones, Esq. Ynysior, Penrhyndu- draeth		1886-87-92, 10 p.c.; 1892, last half, 20 p.c.; 1893, 20 p.c. in Merioneth, and 10 p.c. in Car- narvon and Denbigh	Denbighshire, 15 p.c.	No re-valuation in 50 years, no rent raised within 80
Carnarvon Merioneth Denbigh				
Brynkir and Trefan estates Carnarvon Merioneth	14,000 acres, £7000-£8000	Several years, 5, 10, and 15 p.c.	Several farms, 10 to 20 p.c.	No increase in 50 years, except for accommoda- tion land

MERIONETH.

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), in giving first the County, in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reduction since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
The Hon. C. H. Wynn Rug, Corwen Merionethshire	10,000 acres £8000	5 p.c. for four years; 10 p.c. for one year	In some cases . . .	Rents raised in 1874 about 10 p.c.
R. J. Lloyd Price, Esq. Rhiwlas, Bala Merioneth Denbigh	17,958 acres £8972	1886-87, 10 p.c. where rents paid in full	1888, general. Varying from 10 to 33 p.c. Since last return, £3	A few rents raised of ac- commodation land let by auction
W. R. M. Wynne, Esq. Penarth, Towy Merioneth	9350 acres, about £4430 (agricultural)	March, 1885, 5 p.c.; Lady-day, 1886, 12½ p.c.; Michaelmas, 1886, 10 p.c.; 1887, 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1888, 12½ p.c.; Mi- chaelmas, 1888, 10 p.c.; Lady- day, 1889, 10 p.c.; Michael- mas, 1889, 5 p.c.; Lady-day, 1892, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 15 p.c.; Lady-day, 1893, 15 p.c. Many other allowances to individuals on special occa- sions, and for lime, &c. &c.	£200 per annum since 1880, or thereabouts	No general re-valuation has been made since 1842, and that was not acted upon. Some rents are lower, and some the same as in 1830. Some have been raised for large drainage works, but nothing at all on capital outlay, and in- sufficient to pay for maintenance even. Full particulars can be given as to each farm

APPENDIX II.

277

Charles Jones, Esq., Dervyn Alyn, Rossett, Denbighshire Merioneth	117 acres £137 (including rent of house, garden, and ap- purtenances, £35, and a cottage let for £1)			Land let with house when bought; now reduced	No re-valuation or increase since 1875, when the property was purchased
Messrs. Wayne Aberartho, Llanbedr, Merionethshire Merioneth	800 acres £300		10 p.c. sometimes; Michaelmas, 1892, 10 p.c.	Rent of majority of farms reduced by amount of tithe	Re-valuation in 1865, after railway came. Some rents increased; a few reduced
Mrs. Foulkes and Miss Lloyd Hengwrt, Dolgelley Merionethshire	About 4500 acres		£5 on one farm; £1 on another	£5 on one farm	The old tenants have been kept on at the same rents. On re-letting, some have been slightly raised where the value has risen from the nearness to new railways, &c, also where the land from vicinity to Dolgelley has let as accommodation land
Rev. J. Titley Williams Penllyn, Llanrwst Merioneth Denbigh Carnarvon	1786 acres £875		10 p.c. as a rule; Michaelmas, 1892, 15 p.c. in Merionethshire and 10 p.c. in Denbigh	Lately £5	No re-valuation or increase in rent for 50 years known A farm let for £90 and tithe in 1788 is now let for £85 tithe free
John Leigh, Taylor, Esq., Penmaen Cliffe, Dolgelley Merioneth	400 acres £160 (In 1885 the rent was £200 in 1890 " £170 and 1893 " £160)		10 p.c. last audit; Michaelmas, 1892, 10 p.c.	20 p.c. all round	Rents have been increased by re-valuation within 50 years, but are now lower than ever they were to my knowledge

MERIONETH—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abate- ments since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
E. Gilliat Jones, Esq. Vrondderw, Bala Merioneth	265 acres £120, inclusive of tithe	One farm let at £70, including tithe, from Lady-day, 1893 Reductions, 1st year, £45 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years, £20 The first tenant became bank- rupt and was sold up, <i>not</i> by landlord. Landlord recovered one year's rent The last tenant left farm in such bad condition that there was great difficulty in	One farm £10 rent as in father's lifetime. Al- lowed £6 7s. 6d. in ad- dition for year ending 25th March 1893	
Mr. Thruston . . . 8, Whitburn Street, Bridgenorth Merioneth	4500 acres £1100	1886-89, 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1890, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 15 p.c.; Lady-day, 1893, 15 p.c.	On three-fourths of farms, and in addition three farms, 15 to 20 p.c.	Re-valuation 1860 justified increase, which was not made. A few rents raised and reduced again
Captain John Harnage King Griffith Brach y Celyn, Aber- dovey Merioneth	650 acres £198 agricultural	1888-91, 10 p.c.	None	No record of a rent raised

APPENDIX II.

279

The late Morgan Lloyd, Esq., Q.C. The Grange, Brook- Green, London, W.	1250 acres £305	.	.	10 p.c. several years; 20 p.c. for 1892	One farm 7 p.c.	—
Mertoneth						
W. E. Oakeley, Esq. Pias Tanybwlich, Meri- oneth	10,000 acres £2500	.	.	5 and 10 p.c. often, Michaelmas, 1892, 20 p.c. including tithe	The tithe permanently, and in many cases be- sides, and contemplated	Re-valued 28 years ago, and an increase followed but old rents are as in 1830
Merioneth						
Mrs. Edwards . Dolseran, Dolgelley .	1200 acres £350	.	.	10 p.c. towards repairing farms	None	One re-valuation in 50 years; result, a reduc- tion
Merioneth						
Denbigh						
W. T. Poole, Esq. . Gwynfa, Carnarvon	2000 acres £1000 about	.	.	1885-87, 10 to 15 p.c.; 1885, 5 p.c.; November, 1892, 20 p.c.	None	Very slight increase of old rents in last 30 years. Re-valuation of 1874 showing room for in- crease, but was only adopted in a few in- stances
Merioneth						
Charles A. Jones, Esq. Bronhendre, Carnarvon	408 acres £130 rental	.	.	January 1892, 10 p.c.; June 1892, 20 p.c.; June 1893, 20 p.c.	None	No re-valuation or rent raised in 50 years
Merioneth						
Colonel E. Evans Lloyd . Moelygarredd, Bala	275 acres £125 (excluding accom- modation land)	.	.	Occasionally. Last half, 1892, 20 p.c.	£20 on one farm	Rents almost invariably reduced on expiry of tenancy
Merioneth						

MERIONETH—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Mrs. Scott Pwllarth Uchaf, Towyri Merioneth	7000 acres £1180	15 to 5 p.c. for five years; July 1892, 10 p.c.; January 1893, 15 p.c.; July 1893, 15 p.c.	Some	Re-valuation produced re- duction. No increase in 50 years
Richard Henry Wood, Esq. Pantglas, Trawsfynydd Merioneth	8 to 8000 acres About £1200	September 1886 to March 1888, 25 p.c.; Michaelmas 1895, 20 p.c.	Only upon purchased farms	No re-valuation in 50 years. Rents less than 50 years ago
Carnarvon Charles Williams, Esq., M.D. Hengwin, Dyffryn, Merioneth	450 acres £335	Some, according to circum- stances, for years; 1892, 5 p.c.	One farm £35 . . .	One farm re-valued in 1878 and rent raised
Merioneth William Ansell, Esq. Corygedol, Dyffryn Merioneth	12,000 acres £3000	1885-86, 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1892, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady-day, 1893, 15 p.c.	£102	A few rents raised

APPENDIX II.

281

Sir Henry B. Robertson Pale, Corwen	About 5700 acres £3500	29th September 1882 to } 10 p.c. 25th March 1889 . } 29th September 1891 to } 10 p.c. 25th March 1892 . } 29th September 1892 to } 15 p.c. 25th March 1893 . }	Permanent reductions for years ending :—	£ s. d.	No re-valuation or in- crease in 50 years
Merioneth Denbigh		31st March 1884 19 10 0 " 1885 28 9 0 " 1886 25 0 0 " 1887 66 14 0 " 1888 — " 1889 5 10 0 " 1890 14 0 0 " 1891 — " 1892 2 10 0 " 1893 35 17 0 £197 10 0			
Dr. William Williams 58, Rodney Street, Liver- pool	1400 to 1500 acres. £594	10 p.c. often	Considerable . . .		Some rents raised in 50 years. Re-valuation made on April 29th, 1893, of 1081a. 1r. 27p. resulting in raising the yearly value from £225 to £311
Merioneth					N.B.—Hitherto abate- ments have been allowed on the present rents <i>which are still the old ones.</i>
					Address of valuer: Walter B. C. Jones, Criccieth, Land Agent.

MERIONETH—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reduction since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Mrs. Royle Bala	1835 acres 1084 <i>l</i> .	1883, £14; 1884, £51; 1886, £77 10 <i>s</i> .; 1886, £88 10 <i>s</i> .; 1887, £78 15 <i>s</i> .; 1888, £47; 1892, Michaelmas, and 1893, Lady- day, 10 p.c.	£33 on four tenements	Re-valuation 1873; effect unknown. Rents un- altered since, except as stated in column 4.
John Vaughan, Esq. Nannan, Dolgelley	16,300 acres, viz., 9165 arable and pasture; the remainder sheep walk £3666	10 p.c. several times; 1892, last half, 15 p.c.; 1893, first half, 15 p.c.	None	Re-valuation brought up rental nearly 10 p.c.
Merioneth				

FLINTSHIRE.

P. W. Godsell, Esq., Iscoed Park, Whit- church, Salop	About 900 acres. Rent £1383, including 15 cottages, of which 11 keep a cow and hold 4 to six acres at £174	Many	Don't remember any par- ticulars, but I have made permanent reduc- tions.	No increase or re-valua- tion.
Flint				

P. P. Pennant, Esq., Nantlys, St. Asaph Flint	1395 acres. £1572	Michaelmas 1879, 5 p.c.; Lady Day 1888, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady Day 1893, 10 p.c.	All reduced in 1883 or since. From £1835 to £1572	At first a rise in consequence of capital spent on improvements; afterwards a fall in response to the general fall in prices. Rental. Year. £. s. 1856 . 1683 3 1866 . 1807 18 1876 . 1834 18 1893 . 1572 0
Llewelyn Lloyd, Esq., Woodhayne, Bampton Road, Forest Hill, London Flint	22 acres, £140 (including 2 houses and cottage)	Some		Has never raised a rent
Arthur Phillips Roberts, Esq., Coed Du, Mold Flint	About 800 acres. Rental £675, inclusive of 45 acres of accommodation land at £3 per acre, but exclusive of 100 acres in hand, including £50 per annum for minerals	Amounts varying from 5 p.c. to 20 p.c.	Various permanent reductions have been made, in one case as much as 45 p.c., and in another 12 p.c.	—
James Collinge, Esq., Kinnerton Lodge, Chester Flint	507 acres. £842	None	None	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years
The Representatives of the late General Isaac Gascoigne and Mrs. Dent	581 acres. £466	Rents readjusted and farms relet since 1883. 1883, £90; 1885, £10; 1889, £13		No rents raised in 50 years

FLINTSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Flint Thomas Arthur Hope, Esq., Leadenhall House, 101, Leadenhall Street, London, E.C.	448 acres. £638 . .	1880-85 (except 1884) about 5 p.c. in manure; 1886-88, 1½ p.c.; 1889, 10 p.c.; 1890-91, 7½ p.c.; 1892, 5 p.c.	One farm reduced by £12, from £162 to £150 ; since 1888 one tenant whose rent was £205 has been allowed £55 per annum, so that his rent has practically been reduced to £150	Re-valued in 1864, and increased by nearly 8 per cent.
Flint S. K. Mainwaring, Esq., Oteley, Ellesmere	350 acres. £389 . .	1883, £20; 1884, £15 . .	20 p.c. in one case, 1884	No re-valuation or in- crease known in 50 years
Flint Denbigh Colonel Arthur Mesham, Pontryffydd, Trefnant, R.S.O.	500a. 1r. 32p. £705 10s.	15 p.c.	One-third	Fall of rents
Flint Denbigh				

The Duke of Westminster, K.G., Eaton Hall, Chester	2730 acres	.	.	1885-90, 5 p.c.; 1890-92, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c.; Lady Day 1893, 15 p.c.	On one farm . . .	No re-valuation or in- crease of rent in 50 years
Flint						
W. Carstairs Jones, Esq., Hartsheath, Mold	About			In addition		
Flint	800 acres. £900	.	.	10 p.c. in 1893 . . .	£240	
Denbigh	1700 „ £1000	.	.	10 p.c. in 1893 . . .	£300	
The Earl of Denbigh, Newham Paddock, Lut- worth	2057 acres £2318 2s. 8d.	.	.	Sep. 29, 1885 to March 25, 1890, 15 p.c.; March 25, 1890 to March 25, 1892, 10 p.c.; March 25, 1892 to March 25, 1893, 20 p.c. (in addition to the per- manent reductions, as given in column 4)	£141 13s.	No rents raised during the last 50 years
Flint						
Charles M. Berington, Esq., Little Malvern Court, Worcestershire	242½ acres. £290 .	.	.	From Sept. 29, 1885, to Sept. 29, 1891, 10 p.c.; from Sept. 29, 1892, to March 25, 1893, 15 p.c.	One farm reduced from £20 to £17 in 1891; landlord also paying tithe reduces the rent to £15 Another farm reduced £15 in 1884	Re-valuation in 1857 rents not advanced
Flint.						
A. C. Lewis, Esq., 7, Upper Hamilton Terrace, London.	256a. 1r. 37p. £377 10s.	.	.	.	By amount of tithes £40; also rent reduced £81	
Flint						
Harry W. Buddicom, Esq., Penbedw, Mold	3823 acres. £2645	.	.	1879 to 1890, 15 p.c., since 10 p.c.	£308 in 14 years . . .	No valuation. No rent increased in 15 years
Flint				Sept. 29, 1892 on farms perma- nently reduced, and 20 p.c. others; same to Lady Day 1893		
Denbigh						

FLINTSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Penypyll Estate Flint	10½ acres. £141 .	March 1885-92, 15 p.c.; Michael- mas 1892, 15 p.c.; March 25, 1893, 15 p.c.	£7 in 1889	—
Mrs. Ellen Roskill, Stocyn, Holywell	34 acres .			The rent £80 to Sept. 29th, 1885, reduced to £60 to Sept. 29th, 1892, from that date the rent has been £57 10s., landlady paying tithes, about 28
Flint	26½ acres			Former rent for many years £70 to Sept. 29, 1881; reduced to 55s. to Sept. 29, 1887; present rent, £45 Another farm, rent £100 to March 25, 1886; present rent, £80
William Massey, Esq., Cornelyn, Beaumaris (Land in Anglesey farmed by owner)	40 acres. £55 .	I have been easy about payment of rent, giving time and feel- ing obliged to relinquish large arrear. Gibbons pays rea- sonably well, but Davies would, I feel sure, have been evicted by almost any other landlord	Since the passing of the late Act I have taken upon myself payment of tithes without any claim for repayment by tenant	It is perfectly absurd not to recognise the great opening there has been to Wales owing to the facility of conveyance during the above time and the consequent im- provements of markets. As far as my experience goes, Welsh tenants lay out nothing, landlord does everything. It seems to me a travesty
Flint		Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c. was allowed Davies, and any re- mainder due allowed Gibbons. As to arrears, I have not re- linquished them, but have no		

Thomas Bate, Esq., Kel- sterton, Flintshire Flint	From 600 to 800 acres. A good many small holdings. Nearly 150 acres accommodation land in the town of Flint, and about 100 in Connah's Quay. All property close to Flint and Connah's Quay	intention of enforcing them unless there should be dis- putes which I do not expect 15 p.c. allowed on this year's rent	From 2s. to 10s. per acre. 10s. on accommodation land	of justice to talk of the rights of tenants under such circumstances. Their rights depend solely on their contracts excluding as they do in these districts a number of applicants																								
P. B. Davies-Cooke, Esq., Gwysaney, Mold Flint	2731 acres £3169 rental	10 p.c. in depressed times. 10 p.c. on rent and tithe at the last audit. <table><tr><td>1886</td><td>£</td><td>s.</td><td>d.</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>.</td><td>297</td><td>1 2</td></tr><tr><td>1887</td><td>.</td><td>275</td><td>1 4</td></tr><tr><td>1888</td><td>.</td><td>212</td><td>14 6</td></tr><tr><td>1892</td><td>.</td><td>114</td><td>11 6</td></tr><tr><td>1893</td><td>.</td><td>280</td><td>5 0</td></tr></table> in special cases	1886	£	s.	d.		.	297	1 2	1887	.	275	1 4	1888	.	212	14 6	1892	.	114	11 6	1893	.	280	5 0	£376 since 1881	No information prior to 1881
1886	£	s.	d.																									
	.	297	1 2																									
1887	.	275	1 4																									
1888	.	212	14 6																									
1892	.	114	11 6																									
1893	.	280	5 0																									
Colonel C. J. Trevor Roper, Plas Teg, Mold Flint	.	Arrears constantly excused. Abatements where required. Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c. allowed	In some cases, One farm £10 since last return	No general re-valuation in 50 years. Individual farms re-valued, and rents reduced																								
P. A. Lloyd, Esq., Pen- trehobin, Mold	.	Since 1892 and including, 7 p.c.	All permanently reduced in 1888	No increase for 50 years																								

FLINTSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Flint Basil Phillips, Esq., Rhual, Mold	500 acres. £560 about	20 p.c. in two cases. Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.	The 20 p.c. permanent	No re-valuation or in- crease in 50 years
Flint Lord Mostyn, Mostyn Hall, Mostyn	6350 acres . . .	To those not permanently re- duced— 15 p.c. on 2½ years' rent due Sept. 29, 1885 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1886 10 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1886 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1887 10 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1887 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1888 10 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1888 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1889 10 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1889 5 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1890 5 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1890 5 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1891 5 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1891 5 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1892 15 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1892 15 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1893 15 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1893 15 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1894	The majority of the ten- ants dependent upon agriculture have been permanently reduced at different periods since 1885 (chiefly in 1886 and 1887) from 10 to 24 p.c. In addition to these permanent re- ductions they have re- ceived 10 p.c. on ½ year's rent due Sept. 29, 1892 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1893 10 p.c. do. Sept. 29, 1893 10 p.c. do. Mar. 25, 1894	

Sir Piers W. Mostyn, Bart., Talacre, Flint- shire Flint	About 4015 acres; rental £5054 There are a number of small tenants on the estate (not agricul- tural) which are not included	From 1886 to 1889, 15 p.c. From 1890 to 1892, 10 p.c. From 1892 to 1894, 15 p.c.	Have been made on several farms amount- ing to about £340 per annum	
Harry Barnston, Esq., Crewe Hill, Farnham, Cheshire Flint Denbigh Mertonth	About 924 acres; rental about £440	1886 to 1890, 25 p.c. Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c. Lady Day 1893, 15 p.c. Michaelmas 1893, 15 p.c.	One farm from £140 to £100 " " £62 to £50 " " £84 to £75 Landlord paying the tithe, about £13 a year; land from 10s. to £7 10s.	
Richard Pelham Warren, Wortling House, Bas- ingstoke, Hants Flint	Average 860 acres; rental £929 7s. 1d.	Up to and including the year 1892, £397 18s. 10d.	About £95 . . . 1880, £1644- 1892, £991	

DENBIGHSHIRE.

The Trustees of the late Rev. J. S. Darwell; William Trevor Parkins, Esq., Glasfryn, Gres- ford; Capt. B. T. Grif- fith-Boscawen, Trevalyn Hall, Rossett; joint owners of the Trevalyn Estate	About 2350 acres. About £3000, agriculture Two water corn-mills and several cottages with gardens only not included	1885-7, 10 p.c. allowed; 1887- 93, 10 p.c. allowed; except where permanent reductions were made, or tenants merely holding meadows, and not re- siding on the estate	Since 1886, £326 . . .	No re-valuation of the estate made since 1884, though some rents have been raised meanwhile, but mostly reduced again
---	--	---	------------------------	--

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1	2	3	4	5
Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	Acreage and Rental	Temporary Abatements since 1883	Permanent Reductions since 1883	Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Denbigh Flint				
Major J. Jocely Ffoulkes, Erivfiat, Denbigh	1662 acres. £2088	In many cases since 1879, 1892, made arrangement with bank to help tenants at his expense	£279 since 1879, and also all the tithe now allowed	Rent reduced 25 p.c. in 1815; so remained till 1834. Some increases since; but 1887, when reduction made, substantially the same as in 1834
Denbigh Flint				
R. M. Biddulph, Esq., Chirk Castle, Chirk	7640 acres. Rental of 34 farms averaging about 120 acres = £5708 The above inclusive of one sheep farm, moorland, of 3614 acres, rent £346	Michaelmas 1869 to Michaelmas 1889, 10 p.c. 5,200 Lady Day 1892 to Lady Day 1893, 10 p.c. 520 <u>5,720.</u>	£394 10s. 4d. per annum since 1879	Partial re-valuation in 1875 raised some rents, but reductions have since been made, so that the rental is considerably less than before the re-valuation
Denbigh				
Major - General Wynne, Coed Coch, Abergole	About 9000 acres. About £7000	From 1884 to 1890, 10 p.c. Several had allowances continued, and all the tenants are again getting 10 p.c.	Several	Re-valuation, 1888. Some increase in a few cases on change of tenants; now mostly cancelled by reductions
Denbigh				

Carnarvon Flint	434 acres. cultural	£774, agri-	1885-88, 10 p.c.	1888 onwards, 10 p.c. all round	No increase in 50 years, but a reduction of 10 p.c.
Lieut.-Col. Meredith Pontrebychan Hall, Wrexham					
Denbigh	10,587 acres		Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady day 1893, 10 p.c. in most cases	Nearly all reduced 10 to 20 p.c., and some as much as 25 and 30 p.c.	Some farms raised years ago, but now reduced.
Col. W. Cornvallis West, Ruthin Castle, Ruthin					
Denbigh	29 acres. £40		10 p.c., about 1 year; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.		16 years ago the rents, two occupiers, were houses £100, and land £40 = £200. Now house is £75 and land £40 = £115. In 1892, reductions, 10 p.c. on land, and also repairs, drainage, &c., £13 17s. 10d. This year, 1893, for house tenant £18 15s. The whole quarter's rent allowed towards a new pump
Miss Adelaide Roberts, 9, Castle Street, Ruthin	718 acres. £140		1886-88, £20 per annum; 1889-91, £5 per annum; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c. in one case, and very considerable arrears in Carnarvonshire (£50)	None. 1892; pays tithe in Denbighshire and makes no charge	Brachydinas once raised to £150 per annum during present "taking," but reduced after two years (1879 about) to £120
Denbigh Carnarvon					

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued):

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
John Edward Oldfield, Esq., Farm, Abergelo Denbigh Carnarvon Flint	1000 acres	1 p.c., May 1886; 10 p.c., Dec. 1886; 10 p.c. in 1887; 10 p.c. in 1888; 5 p.c. 1892; 5 p.c., May 1893	Some	No re-valuation, but some rents raised in 50 years
T. D. Thomas, Esq., Bank House, Stourbridge Denbigh Flint	3404 acres. £868 . .	Large sums in abatement and reductions	Never raised a rent. Per- manent reductions, £107 0s. 2d., exclusive of occasional allow- ances	—
Mrs. Wynn Yorke, Dyf- fryn Alod, Abergelo Denbigh	4200 acres. Less than £3000		Permanent reduction of 10 p.c.	No re-valuation in 50 years, nor rents raised as a whole
Mrs. Malmawaring, Gall- faguan, Trefnant, Den- bighshire Denbigh	3900 acres. £3000 . .	1886-87, 10 p.c.; 1888-89-90, 15 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c. and tithes; Lady Day 1893, 5 to 10 p.c. and tithes	On three or four farms .	A re-valuation within 50 years. Some rents raised
Duncan Miller Esq., Gla- nquhar, Abergelo	100 acres. £74 . .	10 p.c. in bad seasons . .	By amount of tithe which equals 12 $\frac{3}{4}$ p.c. roughly	Had in March 1893 re- ceived no rent for 1892

Denbigh	Mrs. Williams-Wyn, Cefn, St. Asaph Denbigh Carnarvon Flint	2000 acres. £2500 (in- cluding cottages and accommodation land)	1886-89, 15 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c.; 1893, 15 p.c.	On three farms in last ten years	No re-valuation as a whole in 50 years. Rental has been reduced
	W. Kerr, Esq., Maesmor, Corwen Denbigh Montgomery	2100 acres . . .	About 10 p.c. annually. Michael- mas 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady Day 1893, 10 p.c.	10 p.c. Denbigh. 20 p.c. Montgomery	Some rents have been raised in 50 years
	Richard James, Esq., soli- citor, Dyffryn, Ayr, Llanrwst Denbighshire Carnarvonshire Cardiganshire	564 acres. £263 . .	1892, 3½ p.c.	£41, including farms pur- chased	No increase in 50 years
	W. D. W. Griffith, Esq., Garn, Trehaunt, R.S.O., Denbighshire	2225 acres. Rental in 1886, £2060	Total amount allowed in abate- ments, <i>i.e.</i> , rent remitted from 1883 to 1892 inclusive, £871 ss. 9d.	Total amount of reduc- tions of rent, from 1883 to 1892 inclusive, taking rents of 1883 as the standard, £1547 12s. 4d.	So far as I can trace, there has been no valuation of the estate for genera- tions; certainly none for 90 years.
	Denbigh Flint		£ s. d. Total . . . 1547 12 4 871 3 9 2418 16 1		No rent on the estate has been raised so far back as can be traced, except in the case of two farms near Rhyll, which were raised from very old rents, one in 1869 and the other in 1880, on reluctant fresh tenants; since 1884 both have been reduced to the pre- vious rents

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner. County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
John Blackwall, Esq., Hendro, Llanrwst Denbigh	About 270 acres. £418, or with tithe £449 18s.	15 p.c. 1892, 15 p.c., and gave each tenant £5	All farms . . .	No re-valuation or increase of rent in 50 years; but on the other hand a large reduction
Sir Theodoro Martin, K.C.B., Bryntisillo, Llangollen Denbigh	About 1100 acres. £400	10 p.c. for some years (farmers then said they did not want 10). 10 p.c. again in 1892	None . . .	No re-valuation or increase in owner's time. He purchased
W. Postock, Esq., Plas Euryr, Colwyn Bay Denbigh Carnarvon	500 acres (mostly in hand)	20 p.c. to a tenant under notice for five years (unsanitary house) who would not go, but he has since left, and given him a year's rent	None . . .	Re-valuation in 1879 showed rental too low, but remained unaltered; one farm increased on change of tenancy (One of my tenants holds at £1 per acre, and pays £3 an acre for land ad- joining)
Simon Yorke, Esq., Erddig Park, Wrexham Denbigh	About 3000 acres . . .	10 p.c. since 1879 . . .	10 p.c. since 1885 . . .	Fall of rent since the period named

Trustees of the late Mrs. Godfrey, Brynestyn, Wrexham	300 acres	10 p.c. since 1879	10 p.c. since 1883	Fall of rent since the period named
Denbigh				
William Jones, Esq., Minaston, Ceflwyn	550 acres. £308	Since 1883 amounting to £162 10s., and 1892, last half, 10 p.c.	£32 per annum	No re-valuation or increase of rent in 50 years
Denbigh chiefly				
Meilir Owen, Esq., Mysevin, Denbigh	800 acres	10 p.c.	On one farm	Re-valuation in 1879 showed rental too low, but remained unaltered. One farm increased on change of tenancy
Denbigh				
William Corbet Yale, Esq., Plas-yu-Yale, Corwen	Excluding demesne lands, holdings, lands under 2 acres, flour-mill and cottages 823 acres. £590	Within the last 8 years £61, more than 10 p.c. on rental; besides Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.; and Lady Day 1893, 10 p.c.	£65 2s. on a rental of £436	Rental 1867, £597; decrease £7. Field valuation 1822, £690; 823 acres, when only 19 acres of wheat and 8 acres of barley were grown on the estate, the remainder being oats and pasture. Valuer, James Boydell, of Chester, only describes one house as "in good repair"
Denbigh				
H R. Hughes, Esq., Kinmel, Abergele	16,223 acres. £19,400	1885-89, 10 p.c.; 1892, 10 p.c. to all tenants above £10, and special allowance to sufferers from floods. 10 p.c. continued in 1893	Very considerable on Lleweni and Glynwern, but less on Kinmel, which is on old and low valuation. The total reduction is £1000 per annum	No re-valuation in 50 years; no increases of rent in owner's time. Rentals of 1812 show rents to have been considerably higher than now
Denbigh				
Flint				
Carnarvon				

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Colonel Honnor, Bryn y Gwalia, Oswestry Denbigh	2200 acres. £1400	10 p.c. in bad years; Michael- mas 1892, 10 p.c. on all farms above £20 rent	Some	No increase in 50 years
John Burton, Esq., The Old Parsonage, Gresford Denbigh	670 acres	Several	In several cases 10, 7, and 5 p.c.	Rents lower than formerly, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ p.c. below re- valuation made by an independent valuer in 1875
Capt. John C. Best, Vivod, Llangollen Denbigh		Sept. 1885 to March 1889, 10 p.c.; Sept. 1889, 5 p.c.	£99 (besides a reduction since 1872 of £50)	No re-valuation or increase of rent in 50 years
Henry B. Sandbach, Esq., Hafodunos, Abergale Denbigh Carnarvon	5000 acres. about £3000	Many since 1883 in individual cases, general percentage dis- approved; 1892, last audit, 5 to 25 p.c.; 1893, £100 given back in 6 cases	Considerable, varying from 10 to 40 p.c., and in several cases owner has undertaken the rent charge without any addition to rent. (Since above) 8 farms reduced by £134 Permanent reduction since 1883 is £543, or 17 p.c. on former rental.	No re-valuation since 1830. No rent raised except for drainage or new buildings. No rent raised at all for 20 years

Trustees of the late Captain Craven, Burton Hall Estate, Denbigh Denbigh Flint	665 acres. £819 . .	1879 and 1880, 10 p.c. allowed; 1892, abatement as before	1886, £218; 1893, 20 p.c. allowed on two farms to be expended on bones, manures, or drainage	No increase made that I am aware of for 50 years except for new buildings, where in some cases interest has been charged
George Rooper, Esq., Nascott House, Watford Denbigh	About 850 acres. Farms about 15s. per acre	None asked	Two farms, 10 p.c.	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years
John Robert Burton, Esq., Minera Hall, Wrexham Denbigh	600 acres	In special cases according to merits	Five cases, 16 p.c., 22 p.c., 15 p.c., 8 p.c., and 11 p.c.	Re-valuation reduced receipts. Large farms lower than in 1881
Trustees of the late R. O. Mouldale, Esq., Llanwrst Denbigh	1500 acres. £862 agricultural	1885-87, 10 p.c.; 1888 and 1889, 5 p.c.; 1892, 10 p.c.	On farms £50	—
Charles William Townsend, Esq., Trevalyn, Rossett, R.S.O. Denbigh	1300 acres. £1450. .	In special cases often. My practice has been to expend sums in bones and drainage rather than in abatements	None	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years
Colonel S. P. Lynes, Derby House, Colchester Denbigh Merioneth	5200 acres. £1600, including house and shooting	10 p.c. since 1883; 10 p.c. last half 1892; 10 p.c. first half 1893	All permanently reduced in 1888 at least 10 p.c.	Re-valuation 1887, rents reduced in most cases, but increased in a few

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Connle-), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Rev. R. Jones Roberts, Pool Quay Vicarage, Weshpool Denbigh Merioneth (Trust Estate) Carnarvon	About 1500 acres. £730 Trust Estate About 400 acres. £204	Paid tithe in lieu of 10 p.c. came to rather more, in some cases a good deal more than 10 p.c.; 5 p.c. additional given at last two audits Trust Estate None generally. Tithe paid for one tenant for a few half years		I have had very little alteration since 1870, merely one farm slightly reduced, and I believe in my father's time, that what rise there has been, has been principally due to altered boundaries, drainage interest, or possibly in one or two cases, too much money having been spent in improving the farm. Sometimes the same rent is paid as 50 years ago, and more, and in others actually less, as Esghrebrill, 1844, £70; 1872 to 1893, £60 Trust Estate I cannot tell when the rents were fixed, but the owner was made a ward in Chancery in 1858, and there has been no

Major Tottenham, Plas Berwyn, Llangollen	6000 acres	Often 10 to 5 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1892, 15 p.c.; Lady Day 1893, 15 p.c.	21 farms permanently, and many for a term of years	change since then, and probably for some time before that Knowledge limited to 1878; no rents raised since
Donbigh Merioneth				
The late Charles Town- shend, Esq., Upton Bank, Chester	1000 acres. £842, not purely agricultural	10 to 15 p.c. generally . .	1890, £80 about, and tithe allowed on four farms	Rents are now as in 1876; but tithe is now paid by landlord instead of tenant in most instances. There was a re-valuation in 1877, and some rents were raised, but this has not been adhered to
Donbigh Merioneth				
Capt. Conwy Rowley Conwy, Bodrhyddan, Rhuddlan, R.S.O.; Sir Edward Bates, Bart., Gym Castle, Llanasa; H. D. Poelin, Esq., Bodnant, Eglwysbach, R.S.O.; the representa- tives of the late Richd. Henning, Esq., Caer- han, Conwy	19,000 acres	1885-88, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas, 1889, Lady Day 1890, Michael- mas 1891, Lady Day 1892, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.	On four farms; no other reductions asked	Have not known the es- tates 50 years
Flint				
Donbigh Carnarvon Montgomery				

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Major Heaton, Plas Heaton, Trefnant Denbigh	1200 acres. £1640	Mostly low rented, on lease; 10 p.c. to all others in de- pressed times, amounting to about £80 per annum	Being low rented and on lease, very few perma- nent reductions	—
Sir George A. Cayley, Bart., Llanerch Park, St. Asaph	2040 acres. £2632	Many; in some cases, 25 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, from 10 to 15 p.c.; 1893, 10 p.c. on rent and tithe; in some cases, 15 p.c., and in one 20 p.c.	1876-86, by £575; 1892, one reduction of £20	No remote information
A. T. Jebb, Esq., The Lyth, Ellesmere Denbigh	About 1380 acres. £900 (or about), after de- ducting the tithe paid by me	5 p.c. to two tenants (on rents of £155 and £65 respectively) for payment within one calen- dar month of rents becoming due	None, except payment of tithe by landlord in- stead of tenant in cer- tain cases, being a dif- ference in one case of from £30 to £40 in favour of tenant	No re-valuation in 50 years. Rents are calculated for good and bad years
Sir Roger H. Palmer, Bart., Cefn Park, Wrex- ham Denbigh Flint	850 acres. £1120	1886-89, 10 p.c.; 1892, last half, 10 p.c.	10 p.c. on three mountain farms	Re-valuation (1887) would have justified increase, but none made in 50 years

	5873 acres. £2175.	1886-88, 10 p.c.; 1892, second half, 15 p.c.	None	No re-valuation or rent raised for 100 years
Lord Newborough, Glyn-tliffon, Carnarvon				
Denbigh				
Merioneth				
Rev. B. Jones-Bateman, Pentremawr, Abergelle		Some	Some	No re-valuation and no increase of rent in 50 years
Denbigh				
Peter Ormrod, Esq., Penylan, Ruabon	1600 acres. £1800	In bone and manure, 10 p.c., and for the last two years 10 p.c. in addition to the above	None	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years
Denbigh				
Sir John H. Puleston, 2, Whitehall Court, London, S.W.	250 acres. £500, about.	10 to 20 p.c., in one case to tenant who bid within 100% of owner at time of purchase, and on the larger farm, which the tenant elected to take on lease for 14 years, liberal deductions made		No re valuation in 50 years known. No rent raised since purchase, 20 years ago
Denbigh				
Lord Bagot, Blithfield, Rugby	19,000 acres. £7496 (including sporting rents and partly furnished houses)	In various cases, Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.; Lady Day, 1893, 10 p.c.; Michaelmas 1893, 10 p.c.	In some cases	1866. Re valuations showed farms to be underlet, but rents were not raised
Denbigh				
Merioneth				
Richard Kerfoot, Esq., Gwyfryn, Abergelle	10 acres. £80	None	None	No re-valuation or increase of 50 years
Denbigh				

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), in giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Sir Watkin Williams- Wynn, Bart., Wynn- istat, Ruabon	137,925 acres. £46,798.	Allowed 1885 to 1890, and special allowances, Michael- mas 1892, 15 p.c.	In many cases, 1892, one reduction of £50, some minor	No general re-valuation, but some increases of rent, never on sitting tenant or his family
Denbigh Flint Montgomery Merioneth Salop Cardigan	1800 acres. £2451	From time to time as was con- sidered advisable	Very considerable reduc- tions, in several cases up to £25 p.c.	—
Colonel Hugh R. Hughes, Ystrad, Denbigh Denbigh Flint	607a. 1r. 23p. £602 8s.	Michaelmas 1885 to Michaelmas 1889, 10 p.c. Michaelmas 1892 to Lady Day 1893, 10 p.c. Michaelmas 1893 to Lady Day 1894, 5 p.c. Special allowance of half-year's rent in one case to meet losses sustained Michaelmas 1887	£103 4s.	No particular remarks to offer

Capt. T. A. Wynn Edwards, Park Cottage, Denbigh	2600 acres. (about)	1100l.	1886-90, 10 p.c. on all farms above £20, also Lady Day rental 1893	On four farms	Twenty years ago tenant for life reduced rents to avoid expense of repairs. Repairs done and rents brought back to original figure
Denbigh Flint			15 p.c. on all farms above £20, and 10 p.c. on all below that amount on Michaelmas rental 1893 and Lady Day 1894		
Rev. Canon Haygarth, The Vicarage, Wimbledon	1820 acres. £1800 450 acres. £96 (mountain chiefly)		10 p.c. for four years after 1883, and the same since Lady Day 1892. For four years after 1883, 10 p.c.	Several considerable reductions	—
* * * * *					
Carnarvon Denbigh Flint	3885 acres. £3666 agricultural (including accommodation land)		1885-89, 10 p.c. Since, 5 p.c. Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c.	On several farms	No re-valuation and no increase of individual rent in 50 years
John Jones, Esq., Moss-fields, Whitechurch	300 acres. £306		1892, 10 p.c.		Re-valuation in 1874 showed higher rentability, but rents not raised
Denbigh					
Mrs. McEwen, Penrallt, Abergele	75 acres. £50			£15	—
Denbigh					
Colonel Henry Howard, Wygfair, St. Asaph	1530 acres. £1792		Some, 1892, 10 p.c.	16 p.c.	No re-valuation or rise in rent in 50 years
Denbigh Flint			Total	26 p.c.	

DENBIGHSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Sir Robert A. Chncliffe, Bart., Acton Park, Wrex- ham Denbigh	2200 acres. £3215 ex- clusive of residential property	1887-89, to all tenants except recent takers, 10 p.c. March 1892, 10 p.c. Nov. 1893, 10 p.c.	£200	Rental as in 1860

MONTGOMERYSHIRE.

Captain D. H. Mytton, Garth, Walslipool Montgomery	3300 acres. £4489 .	10 p.c.	10 p.c. in many instances	No tenant's rent was raised when prices were good, and the per- manent fall in value of rent is in my opinion 10 p.c. in addition to temporary abatement
Major Henry Lloyd, Pils- ford Hall, Northampton Montgomery	285 acres. £300 .	15 p.c. for three years prior to 1892, Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c. to farm tenants in bone manure but not to cottagers	23 p.c. on one farm (£211 to £162) from Septem- ber 1887	No re-valuation and no increase of rent in 50 years

APPENDIX II.

305

The Right Hon. the Earl of Powis, Powis Castle, Welshpool	45,000 acres. Nett rental, Lady Day 1891, £25,894	Lady Day 1884 . . . 1,770 1886 . . . 1,700 1886 . . . 1,779 1887 . . . 2,700 1888 . . . 2,067 1889 . . . 1,818 1890 . . . 1,172 1891 . . . 1,242 £14,248	£700 since 1888, which with the temporary abatement since Lady Day 1891 has been made permanent	10 years to Lady Day 1849 . . . 272,386 Do. 1859 . . . 204,642 Do. 1869 . . . 283,685 Do. 1879 . . . 293,348 Do. 1889 . . . 269,884 Lady Day 1890 . . . 27,206 Do. 1891 . . . 27,136
Major Corbett Winder, Yaynor Park, Berriew, R.S.O.	5157a. 2r. 9p. £5165 8s. 3d.	A further temporary abatement of 10 p.c. amounting to £2000 per annum has been made from the new rents due Lady Day 1893	12 p.c. on a rental of £846 12s.	There have been no alterations of any importance on the estate, except as shown in the preceding columns
Montgomery				
Trustees of the late General Woosnam	1162 acres. £1118	Since 1879. Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c. for three years	Some farms	A re-valuation and slight increase
Executors of the late P. Elwell, Esq.	1390 acres. £404 . .	1885-89, 10 p.c.; 1889-92, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c.; 15 p.c. agreed to be given for three years from Michaelmas 1892	10 p.c. all round . . .	Valuation on purchase in 1865; increase 15 p.c.
Montgomery				
Sir John Conroy, Balliol College, Oxford	1701 acres. £1117	1885 to 1890, 20 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 15 p.c.	1890, 10 p.c. all round .	Re-valuation 1876; rise 10 p.c. (vide col. 4 for 10 p.c. reduction)

U

MONTGOMERYSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Montgomery S. Barlow Wright, Esq., Pantlidal, Machynlleth Montgomery	139 acres	Purchased, 1889 10 p.c. allowed on Michaelmas rent 1892, and intend allow- ing same on Lady Day when paid		Never raised a rent
Rev. J. R. Williams, Do- nanog, Llanfair Caere- inion, Welshpool Montgomery	1280 acres. £615 .	10 p.c. in bad years	£60 in 10 years . . .	Re-valuation in 1868, raised rental £100; re- valuation 1886, reduced rental
Thomas Gill, Esq., Bryn- derwen, Twichelythan, R.S.O. Montgomery	320 acres. £320 .	None	£5 per annum to widow	No re-valuation or in- crease known in 50 years
John Pugh Vaughan Pryse, Esq., Bweli- bychan, Llanybyther, R.S.O. Montgomery, &c.		10 p.c. from Lady Day 1888, in- cluding the new tenant (who was allowed £20 for three years for exhausted farm) from the time that allowance ceased	—	—

APPENDIX II.

307

Rev. R. M. White, Church- stoke Rectory, Mont- gomeryshire	65 acres. £50	.	1892, last half, 10 p.c.	£10	.	Re-valuation reduced re- ceipts
Montgomery						
Mrs. Bulkeley Williams, Plas Meredith, Garth- myl, Montgomeryshire	262 acres. £222	.	1890 and 1891, 10 p.c.; Lady Day 1892, 5 p.c.; Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.	General reduction in 1885	.	Re-valuation 1889, but rents remain as before, i.e., none raised in 50 years
Montgomery						
Evan Woosnam Savage, Esq., Glandulas, New- town	625 acres	.	1892, last half, 10 p.c.; 1893, first half, 10 p.c.	10 to 14 p.c.	.	No re-valuation in 20 years, which is all that owner knows
Montgomery						
Col. and Mrs. Lloyd Verney, Clochfaen, Llanidloes	5600 acres. £1325 (mort- gage of £17,000 left by former proprietor)	.	$\frac{1}{2}$ year ending Lady Day 1888 Do. Michaelmas 1888 Do. Lady Day 1889 Do. Lady Day 1892 Do. Michaelmas 1892 Do. Lady Day 1893 10 p.c. returned on each of these occasions	£178 14s.	.	Valuations at various times, and reduced accord- ingly
Montgomery Radnor						
Sir Henry Wiggin, Bart., Garthgwyncon, Mach- ynlleth	1250 acres. £400	.	5 and 10 p.c. often; 1892, second half, 10 p.c.	None	.	Re-valuation on purchase 18 years ago
Montgomery						
Rev. T. B. M. Owen, Tods- more, Oswestry	800 acres. £95	.	None	None	.	No re-valuation or in- crease in 50 years
Montgomery						

MONTGOMERYSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), in giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Basis and Fall of Rent, going for the most Part over a Period of 50 Years
Charles Harrop Beck, Esq., Upton Priory, near Macclesfield Montgomery	2900 acres. £1413	1883-92, average of $7\frac{1}{2}$ p.c. 1892, second half, 10 p.c. on all over £10 rental, 1893, first half, 10 p.c. on all over £10 rental	10 p.c. since 1883	No re-valuation in 50 years of estate as a whole
Evan Jones Owen, Esq., N. & S. Wales Bank, Limited, Llanrwst Montgomery	80 acres. £90	Farm only let during last $2\frac{1}{2}$ years (since March 1891); 1892, second half, 15 p.c. and continued since (at same rate)		No re-valuation in 50 years
J. Marshall Dugdale, Esq., Llwyn, Llanfyllin, Os- westry Montgomery	923 acres (let). £1036	Some in 1883 and 1884; 1892, last half, 10 p.c.	Reduced most rents on becoming owner. £70 on two farms. 1892, one rent reduced £5	No re-valuation in 50 years Rents reduced
Charles Watkin Williams Wynn, Esq., Coedy- manen, Welshpool Montgomery	1600 acres. £1628	1885-91, 10 p.c.; in some cases 15 p.c.	£10 on one farm	No cases of rent raised ex- cept interest on drainage

Rev. T. J. Williams and the Misses Williams, Waddesdon Rectory, Aylesbury	500 acres. £667 . . .	10 p.c. often; 1892, last half, 17½ to 10 p.c.	£15 on one farm. None asked	Re-valuations used to increase, but now reduce rental
Montgomery				
P. Arthur Beck, Esq., Derwen, Welshpool	108 acres. £166 . . .	1885, 20 p.c. . . .	Rental reduced by £39 in 1887	Re-valuation resulted in reduction Remission made in last Lady Day rents, £22 5s. All the tenants brought their <i>full</i> rents, and asked for <i>no reduction</i> , but considering the bad times, I allowed them the above remission, viz., £22 5s.
Montgomery				
Capt. John Kitto, Glandwr, Llanidloes	650 acres . . .	Some, and at Michaelmas 1892, 20 p.c.	None	No re-valuation or increase in 30 years
Montgomery				
C. H. A. Hamer, Esq., Oakville, Belle Vue, Shrewsbury	496 acres. £332 . . .	1892, second half, 10 p.c.; 1893, first half, 10 p.c.	£20 for 3 years on one farm	—
Montgomery				
Evan Kinsey, Esq., Maesunawr, Caersws	570 acres . . .	As I did not increase my rents during the good times, my tenants were satisfied for some time 1892, second half, 10 to 7½ p.c., and in some cases tithes	One farm left me in 1883, 20 p.c. and tithes. One farm 15 p.c.	Rent generally same as in 1849
Montgomeryshire				

MONTGOMERYSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reduction since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
Sir John Coke, K.C.B., and Rev. William Coke Montgomery.	864 acres. free	10 p.c. and 5 p.c. on occasions March 1893, part 5 p.c. and part 10 p.c.	On 10 farms out of 11	Re-valuation in 1860 caused slight increase, which is now cancelled and rents reduced by nearly 20 p.c.
Lord Sudeley, Gregynog, Newtown Montgomery	18,072 acres. £12,404 including cottages	1884, 5 p.c.; 1885 and 1886, 15 p.c.; 1887, 20 p.c.; 1888, 7½ p.c.; 1890, 5 p.c.; 1891, 10 p.c.; 1892, 20 p.c. (Half-year) Lady Day 1893, 20 p.c.	On 56 farms 14½ p.c. on the average (Lady Day 1892 all who had not been reduced 20 p.c. re- ceived difference as abatements and the same up to Lady Day 1893 rents) 10 p.c. on five farms; in one case making 27½ p.c. on 1883 rental; in another, 27 p.c.	Rents in 1892 as in 1842
Trustees of the late James Walton, Esq., Dolforgan Estate, Kerry, Newtown Montgomery	4447 acres. Rental £2781	Sept. 1885, 20 p.c.; March 1886, 20 p.c.; Sept. 1886, 15 p.c.; March 1887, 15 p.c.; Sept. 1887, 15 p.c.; March 1888, 15 p.c.; Sept. 1888, 10 p.c.; March, 1889, 5 p.c.; Sept.	With two or three excep- tions strictly there have been no permanent re- ductions	On the whole higher, some considerably

D. Wintingham Stable stable, Esq., Wanstead, Essex (The property belonged to the late Miss E. C. Los- combe, who died 21st August 1893)	730 acres, of which 260 are mountain land, over which I have all rights but mineral £262 (farmus); £8 (cot- tages)	1889, 5 p.c.; March 1892, 5 p.c.; Sept. 1892, 15 p.c.; March 1893, 15 p.c. 1884, £20 arrears written off; 1885, Michaelmas, 15 p.c.; 1886, Lady Day, 15 p.c.; Michaelmas, 25 p.c.; 1887, Lady Day, 20 p.c.; 1888, Lady Day, 20 p.c., Michaelmas, 15 p.c.; 1889, Lady Day, 10 p.c., Michaelmas, 5 p.c.; 1890, Lady Day, 5 p.c.; 1891, Michaelmas, 5 p.c.; 1892, Lady Day, 2½ p.c., Michaelmas, 15 p.c.; 1893, Lady Day, 15 p.c.	One farm and mill £14 18s. per annum	Rents raised from £223 to £262 since 1842, but £260 was invested in land, part of that now let for £262 in 1866 Neither I nor my late aunt, Miss Loscombe, who was first interested in the land in 1870, ever raised a rent
Walter H. Long, Esq., M.P., Rood Ashton, Trowbridge Montgomery	694 acres. £105 . . .	£10 per annum in lime. Michael- mas 1892, 10 p.c.	£5 in 1884 . . .	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years
Trustees of the late John Naylor, Esq. Montgomery	11,000 acres. £10,500 . .	10 p.c. for some years. 1892, second half, 5 p.c. in some cases, 10 p.c. in others	Nearly all rents reduced	Portions re-valued for re- duction. No rents in- creased on sitting tenant, except sometimes for owner's improvements
J. E. Severne, Esq., Wal- lop Hall, Shrewsbury Montgomery	779 acres. £365 . . .	Some. Michaelmas 1892, 10 p.c.	Some . . .	No re-valuation and no in- crease of rent in 50 years
Major D. W. Evans, Kings- land, Shrewsbury Montgomery	466 acres. £545 . . .	1892, 10 p.c.; second half, 10 p.c. 1893, 10 p.c.	£90 per annum . . .	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years

MONTGOMERYSHIRE—(continued).

1 Name and Address of Owner, County (or Counties), giving first the County in which most of the Property is situated	2 Acreage and Rental	3 Temporary Abatements since 1883	4 Permanent Reductions since 1883	5 Observations as to Rise and Fall of Rent, going for the most part over a Period of 50 Years
J. L. Rainier, Esq., Brithdir Hall, Berriew, R.S.O. Montgomery	500 acres. £730 . .	1884-88, 10 p.c. 1893, an allowance of $7\frac{1}{2}$ p.c. was made to agricultural tenants on the reduced rental	All round since 1888. On the agricultural land prior to 1883 there were considerable reductions	No re-valuation or increase in 50 years. Included in the above rental are two public-houses and other property not agricultural. The rent for the whole estate in or about 1878 was £874, and the reduction has been made in the agricultural holdings
John Cooke Hilton, Esq., Oak Bank, Fallowfield, near Manchester Montgomery	1206 acres . . . 1893 . . . Rental . . . £721 Tithe . . . 41 Nett . . . 680 :	1892, $12\frac{1}{2}$ p.c.; 1893, 15 p.c.; March rents collected in July; September rents collected in January	Very general reductions made previous to 1892, which have in their nature become permanent. The abatements made in 1892-3 are in addition to these former reductions	Rental believed to be about 35 p.c. less than in 1880
Richard Peyton, Esq., Cwmthaladr, Machynlleth	1020 acres. £300 . .	In many cases . . .	Rents in agreements are nominal, so as to maintain value of fee simple. Permanent reductions	Bought in 1874. No increase since, but decided reduction

Montgomery	1800 acres. £1300	1886-88, 10 p.c.; 1892, last half, 10 p.c.; and each half year since 1892 to present 10 p.c.	have been made upon every farm to date	Does not think any rents have been raised in last 30 years												
Mrs. Howell, Craigydon, Aberdovey			Estate purchased in "the early seventies" at Llanfair, and rents reduced generally													
Montgomery			Instances in Llanfair Parish.													
Merioneth			<table><tr><th>Rent when purchased.</th><th>Present Rent.</th></tr><tr><td>£</td><td>£</td></tr><tr><td>Plas Jolyn 80</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>Adwywynt 84</td><td>74</td></tr><tr><td>Bronyfedw 47</td><td>40</td></tr><tr><td>Creweddin 70</td><td>50</td></tr></table> 10 p.c. additional allowed in recent times, and manure, lime, &c., allowed. Some of the farms in the neighbourhood of Machynlleth have also been permanently reduced 10 p.c. and more	Rent when purchased.	Present Rent.	£	£	Plas Jolyn 80	70	Adwywynt 84	74	Bronyfedw 47	40	Creweddin 70	50	
Rent when purchased.	Present Rent.															
£	£															
Plas Jolyn 80	70															
Adwywynt 84	74															
Bronyfedw 47	40															
Creweddin 70	50															

APPENDIX III.

PARTICULARS RELATING TO CHAPELS ON THE PENRHYN ESTATE.

Denominations	Where Situate	Commencement of Lease	Term of Years	Ground Rent	Parish	Remarks
Calvinistic Methodist Congregational . . .	Hirael, Bangor . . .	12th May, 1870 . . .	40	£ s. d. 1 0 0	Bangor	On ordinary building terms (valuable site)
Wesleyan . . .	" . . .	12th Nov. 1875 . . .	60	8 0 0	"	On site of buildings previously let at £20 per annum
Baptist . . .	" . . .	12th Nov. 1878 . . .	40	4 0 0	"	O'd building given up by Wesleyans on building above
Congregational . . .	Pndref, Bangor . . .	12th Nov. 1880 . . .	80	15 0 0	"	Ordinary building lease (valuable site)
" . . .	Glasynfryn, Bangor. . .	1st July, 1886 . . .	99	1 0 0	"	The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
Calvinistic Methodists	Pentir, Bangor . . .	May 1831 . . .	£00	1 0 0	"	With chapel house. The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
" . . .	Caerhun, Bangor . . .	— . . .	999	0 10 0	"	With chapel house. The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
Wesleyan . . .	Tregarth . . .	12th Nov. 1859 . . .	30	1 0 0	Llandeagai	Do.—All rates paid by Lord Penrhyn (about to be renewed)
Congregational . . .	Sling . . .	12th Nov. 1877 . . .	40	1 0 0	"	Do.—All rates paid by Lord Penrhyn
Wesleyan . . .	" . . .	12th Nov. 1879 . . .	40	2 0 0	"	"

Calvinistic Methodists	Penygroes	—	Yearly	1	0	0	"	Do.—Lease expired—held at original ground rent; rates paid by Lord Penrhyn
Wesleyan Calvinistic Methodists	Llandegai Mountain	12th Nov. 1871	40	0	10	0	"	Do.—Rates paid by Lord Penrhyn
	"	12th Nov. 1877	30	3	3	0	"	Lease renewed at increased ground rent, when £300 was contributed by Lord Penrhyn towards building minister's house; rates paid by Lord Penrhyn
Congregational Baptist.	"	12th Nov. 1876	30	0	5	0	"	With chapel house. The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
	Gilfach	May 1814	99	0	7	6	Llanllechid	
Congregational	Caegwigin	May 1825	101	0	10	0	"	The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
Wesleyan Baptist.	Rachub	12th Nov. 1876	40	0	10	0	"	With chapel house
Calvinistic Methodists (Jerusalem)	Coetmor, Bethesda	12th Nov. 1884	61	1	10	0	"	With chapel house and schoolroom.—Lease renewed at original ground rent
	"	12th Nov. 1872	30	1	0	0	"	Ordinary building terms
Congregational	Coed Quarry	12th Nov. 1884	80	7	0	0	"	With chapel house
Wesleyan	Penybryn	12th Nov. 1871	40	2	0	0	"	
Calvinistic Methodists	Tynymaes	12th Nov. 1873	30	0	10	0	"	
Congregational	"	12th Nov. 1850	60	0	10	0	"	
Calvinistic Methodists	Capel Curig	12th Nov. 1876	40	0	10	0	Llanrhy-chwyn	
	Aber	12th Nov. 1861	80	1	0	0	Aber	
Wesleyan	"	1st Jan. 1859	60	1	0	0	"	
Calvinistic Methodists	Pontfadog	12th Nov. 1871	60	0	5	0	Ysptyty	
"	Rhydymerch	1885	60	0	10	0	Pennmachno	The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn

PARTICULARS RELATING TO CHAPELS ON THE PENRHYN ESTATE—(continued).

Denominations	Where Situate	Commencement of Lease	Term of Years	Ground Rent	Parish	Remarks
Calvinistic Methodists	Pearhynisaf .	1854	60	£ s. d. 1 0 0	Pennachno	With chapel house. The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn
Wesleyan . . .	Hafodyfraith .	25th Sept. 1864	30	0 10 0	"	The land on which this chapel was built was subsequently bought by Lord Penrhyn

N.B.—Two freehold sites have been sold by Lord Penrhyn for chapels in Carnarvonshire.

PARTICULARS RELATING TO CHAPELS ON THE GWYDYR ESTATE.

Denominations	Where Situate	Subject	Commencement of Lease	Term of Years	Ground Rent	Remarks
DOLWYDDLEN PARISH.						
Independents	Blaenau, Dolwyddelen	Chapel and house	1st November, 1872	99	£ s. d. 1 1 0	Site offered at a rent of 10s. Trustees preferred to pay £5 off ground-rent for superior site—as chapel only has been built £1 1s. only is charged
"	Dolwyddelen Village.	Chapel, vestry room, and house	1st November, 1877	99	1 1 0	
Calvinistic Methodists						
"	"	Chapel, &c.	Not known	—	1 10 0	Held under an old lease
"	"	Chapel and cottages	Not known, but lease will not expire for about 50 years	—	3 4 0	
"	"	Chapel, vestry room, and house	1st November, 1877	99	5 0 0	Free site offered if trustees would give up site of old chapel
"	Blaenau, Dolwyddelen	Chapel erected, house not yet built	1st May, 1879.	99	0 10 6	
Wesleyan Methodists	Dolwyddelen Village.	Chapel and vestry room	1st May, 1878.	99	1 0 0	
BETWS-Y-COED PARISH.						
Independents	Bettws-y-Coed Village	Chapel, vestry room, and house	1st November, 1869	93	1 1 0	
LLANRHYCHWYN PARISH.						
Calvinistic Methodists	Llanrhychwyn	Chapel	1st November, 1881	99	0 10 0	

PARTICULARS RELATING TO CHAPELS ON THE GWYDYR ESTATE—(continued).

Denominations	Where Situate	Subject	Commencement of Lease	Term of Years	Ground Rent	Remarks
TREFRIW PARISH.						
Independents	Crafnant	Chapel	1st November, 1875	99	£ s. d. 0 10 6	
"	Trefriw Village	Chapel and vestry, house not yet built	1st May, 1879	99	1 0 0	
Calvinistic Methodists	"	Chapel and house	Not known	—	2 12 6	
TREWDYR TOWNSHIP.						
Calvinistic Methodists	Nant Bwlch-yr-hewin	Chapel, house, and stable	1st November, 1884	99	1 1 0	
"	Pont y Cyffing, Capel Gurig	Chapel and house	1st May, 1874	99	0 10 0	

In no case has a site for a chapel been refused, at all events by the late Baroness Willoughby de Eresby or by the present lord.

PARTICULARS RELATING TO CHAPELS ON THE VAYNOL ESTATE.

Name of Chapel	Parish	Term	Ground Rent	Remarks
Calvinistic Methodists:—				
Cefnywan	Llanddeiniolen .	99	£ s. d. 0 1 0	} Leases offered of 99 years
Dinorwic	"	99	0 1 0	
Fachwen	"	For Mr. Asabeton Smith's life	0 10 0	
Hebron	Llanberis	No lease	0 1 0	
Rehoboth	"	99	0 2 0	} This lease had a 1s. ground rent originally, but 1s. was added 10 or 12 years ago for a piece of ground added to chapel premises 30 years had expired before the 60 years' lease was granted
Nazareth	Llanrug	99	0 5 0	
Ruifias	Llanddeiniolen .	60	1 5 0	
Bethania	Bangor	99	0 5 0	
Congregationalists:—				
Siloh	"	99	0 1 0	
Maes-y-dref Chapel (Clwt- y-bont)	Llanddeiniolen .	99	1 1 0	
Jerusalem	Llanberis	99	0 1 0	
Drws-y-coed	Beddgelert	99	0 1 0	

It will therefore be seen that in some cases yearly tenancies are actually preferred to leases, when the choice is offered to the connection.

A. SITES OF CHAPELS ON THE ESTATES OF SIR WATKIN

WILLIAMS WYNN, BART.

	Annual Rent.
1. Wesleyan Chapel at Llansilio	£0 1 0
2. Independent Chapel at Braichywaen, Llanfihangel	0 1 0
3. Baptist Chapel at Pont Llogell, Llanfihangel	0 2 6
4. Wesleyan Chapel at Rhydleche	0 1 0
5. " at Dolwar	0 10 0
6. Independent Chapel, cottage, garden, and stable at Neinthirion, Llanerfyl	1 0 0
7. Wesleyan Chapel and site of burial ground given gratis, 1894, at Glasbwl, Machynlleth	—
8. Independent Chapel, Ffynnonogledd, Llanbrynmair	0 1 3
9. Independent Chapel, Pandy, Llanbrynmair	0 1 0
10. " " Bontdolgadfan "	0 1 0
11. " " and stable, Tafolwern, Llanbrynmair	0 1 0
12. Independent Chapel, Talerddig, Llanbrynmair	0 1 3
13. Peniel Chapel, Rhydsarn, Llanuwchllyn	} Lately con- veyed gratis.
14. Carmel " Dolhendre ucha "	
15. Sion " cottage, and gardens at Rhydybod "	
16. Baptist Chapel near Tyddynfelin, Llanbrynmair	
17. Chapel, cottage, and piece of ground near Tyddyn, Mawr, Trawsfynydd	0 5 0

The following chapels and sites, &c., were sold to the Calvinistic Methodist Body at Michaelmas 1885:

18. House and chapel at Llanrhaiadr, Denbighshire.
19. Chapel, cottage, and garden, at Eglwyseg, Llangollen.
20. Chapel and house at Dolanog, Llanfihangel.
21. Two cottages, gardens, and buildings, at Llanfihangel.
22. Caermynech Chapel, near Pont Llogell, Llangadfan.
23. Goshen Chapel, near Sychtyn, Llanerfyl.
24. Zion Chapel, cottage, and land, at Llanwrin.
25. Chapel in Llanwrin Village.
26. Chapel at Gwerngerynt, Llanbrynmair.
27. Chapel at Staylittle, Trefeglwys.
28. Schoolroom at Dolhendre, Llanuwchllyn.
29. Chapel, cottage, and garden, Gŵrhos, Llangewer.

The following are sites of chapels, &c., given or sold at a trifling price at various sums:

30. Independent Chapel at Rhosrobin, Wrexham.
31. Welsh Wesleyan Chapel at Cefnawr, Ruabon.
32. Calvinistic Methodist Chapel, Cefn, Ruabon.
33. Congregational Chapel at Ruabon.
34. Wesleyan Chapel at Strydisaf, Ruabon.
35. " at Cefnbychan, Ruabon.
36. Salvation Army Barracks at Cefnawr, Ruabon.

A Classified Catalogue

OF WORKS IN

GENERAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

91 AND 93 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, AND 32 HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
BADMINTON LIBRARY (THE) -	10	MANUALS OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY -	16
BIOGRAPHY, PERSONAL MEMOIRS, &c. -	7	MENTAL, MORAL, AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY -	14
CHILDREN'S BOOKS -	26	MISCELLANEOUS AND CRITICAL WORKS -	29
CLASSICAL LITERATURE TRANSLATIONS, ETC. -	18	MISCELLANEOUS THEOLOGICAL WORKS -	31
COOKERY, DOMESTIC MANAGEMENT, &c. -	28	POETRY AND THE DRAMA -	18
EVOLUTION, ANTHROPOLOGY, &c. -	17	POLITICAL ECONOMY AND ECONOMICS -	16
FICTION, HUMOUR, &c. -	21	POPULAR SCIENCE -	24
FUR AND FEATHER SERIES -	12	SILVER LIBRARY (THE) -	27
HISTORY, POLITICS, POLITY, POLITICAL MEMOIRS, &c. -	3	SPORT AND PASTIME -	10
LANGUAGE, HISTORY AND SCIENCE OF -	16	TRAVEL AND ADVENTURE, THE COLONIES, &c. -	8
LONGMANS' SERIES OF BOOKS FOR GIRLS -	26	VETERINARY MEDICINE, &c. -	9
		WORKS OF REFERENCE -	25

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS.

	Page		Page		Page		Page
Abbott (Evelyn) -	3, 18	Bacon -	7, 14	Boedder (B.) -	16	Cholmondeley-Pennell	
— (T. K.) -	14, 15	Baden-Powell (B. H.) -	3	Bolland (W. E.) -	14	(H.) -	11
— (E. A.) -	14	Bagshot (W.) -	7, 16, 29	Bosanquet (B.) -	14	Christie (Nimmo) -	19
Acland (A. H. D.) -	3	Bagwell (R.) -	3	Boyd (Rev. A. K. H.) -	7, 29, 31	Cicero -	18
Acton (Eliza) -	28	Bain (Alexander) -	14	Brassey (Lady) -	8, 9	Clarke (Rev. R. F.) -	16
Acworth (H. A.) -	18	Baker (James) -	21	— (Lord) -	3, 8, 12, 16	Clodd (Edward) -	17
Adeane (J. H.) -	7	— (Sir S. W.) -	8	Bray (C. and Mrs.) -	14	Clutterbuck (W. J.) -	9
Æschylus -	18	Balfour (A. J.) -	11, 31	Bright (J. F.) -	3	Cochrane (A.) -	19
Ainger (A. C.) -	12	Ball (J. T.) -	3	Broadfoot (Major W.) -	10	Comyn (L. N.) -	26
Aibemarle (Earl of) -	11	Baring-Gould (Rev. S.) -	27, 29	Brügger (W. C.) -	7	Conington (John) -	18
Alden (W. L.) -	21	Barnett (Rev. S. A. & Mrs.) -	16	Brown (J. Moray) -	11	Conybeare (Rev. W. J.)	
Allen (Grant) -	24	Baynes (T. S.) -	29	Browning (H. Ellen) -	9	& Howson (Dean) -	27
Allingham (W.) -	18, 29	Beaconsfield (Earl of) -	21	Buck (H. T.) -	12	Coventry (A.) -	11
Anstey (F.) -	21	Beaufort (Duke of) -	10, 11	Bull (T.) -	3	Cox (Harding) -	10
Aristophanes -	18	Becker (Prof.) -	18	Burke (U. R.) -	3	Crake (Rev. A. D.) -	26
Aristotle -	14, 18	Beesly (A. H.) -	19	Burrows (Montagu) -	4	Creighton (Bishop) -	4
Armstrong (G. F. Savage) -	19	Bell (Mrs. Hugh) -	19	Butler (E. A.) -	24	Cunningham (G. C.) -	3
— (E. J.) -	7, 19, 29	Bent (J. Theodore) -	8	— (Samuel) -	29	Curzon (Hon. G. N.) -	3
Arnold (Sir Edwin) -	8, 19	Besant (Sir Walter) -	3			Cutts (Rev. E. L.) -	4
— (Dr. T.) -	3	Bickerdyke (J.) -	11, 12	Cameron of Lochiel -	12		
Ashley (W. J.) -	16	Bicknell (A. C.) -	8	Cannan (E.) -	12	Davidson (W. L.) -	14, 16
Astor (J. J.) -	21	Bird (R.) -	31	— (F. Laura) -	13	Davies (J. F.) -	18
Atelier du Lys (Author of) -	26	Black (Clementina) -	21	Carmichael (J.) -	19	De la Saussaye (C.) -	32
		Blackwell (Elizabeth) -	7	Chesney (Sir G.) -	3	Deland (Mrs.) -	26
		Boase (Rev. C. W.) -	4	Chisholm (G. G.) -	25	Dent (C. T.) -	11
Babington (W. D.) -	17					Deploige -	17
						De Salis (Mrs.) -	28, 29

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS—continued.

	Page		Page		Page		Page
De Tocqueville (A.) -	3	Jefferies (Richard) -	30	Nansen (F.) -	7	Spedding (J.) -	7, 14
Devas (C. S.) -	16	Jones (H. Bence) -	25	Nesbit (E.) -	20	Stanley (Bishop) -	24
Dickinson (G. L.) -	4	Johnson (J. & J. H.) -	30	Newman (Cardinal) -	22	Steel (A. G.) -	10
Dougall (L.) -	21	Jordan (W. L.) -	16			— (J. H.) -	10
Dowell (S.) -	16	Jowett (Dr. B.) -	17			Stephen (Sir James) -	8
Doyle (A. Conan) -	21	Joyce (P. W.) -	4	O'Brien (W.) -	6	— (Leslie) -	9
Dreyfus (Irma) -	30	Justinian -	14	Ogle (W.) -	18	Stephens (H. Morse) -	6
Du Bois (W. E. B.) -	4			Oliphant (Mrs.) -	22	— (W. W.) -	8
Dufferin (Marquis of)	12	Kalisch (M. M.) -	32	Oliver (W. D.) -	9	Stevens (R. W.) -	31
Dunbar (Mary F.) -	20	Kant (I.) -	14, 15	Onslow (Earl of)	12	Stevenson (R. L.) -	23, 26
		Kaye (Sir J. W.) -	12	Orchard (T. N.) -	31	Stock (St. George) -	15
Ebrington (Viscount)	12	Kerr (Rev. J.) -	15	Osbourne (L.) -	23	'Stonehenge' -	10
Egbert (J. C.) -	18	Killick (Rev. A. H.) -	15			Storr (F.) -	14
Ellis (J. H.) -	13	Kitchin (Dr. G. W.) -	4	Palmer (A. H.) -	8	Stuart-Wortley (A. J.) -	11, 12
Ewald (H.) -	4	Knight (E. F.) -	5, 9, 12	Park (W.) -	13	Stubbs (J. W.) -	6
		Köstlin (J.) -	7	Parr (Mrs. Louisa) -	26	Sturdy (E. T.) -	30
Falkener (E.) -	13			Payne-Gallwey (Sir		Sturgis (J.) -	20
Farnell (G. S.) -	18	Ladd (G. T.) -	15	R.) -	11, 13	Suffolk & Berkshire	
Farrar (Dean) -	16, 21	Lang (Andrew) 5, 10, 11, 13,		Peary (Mrs. Josephine) -	9	— (Earl of) -	11
Fitzwygram (Sir F.) -	10	14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26, 30		Peek (H.) -	11	Sullivan (Sir E.) -	12
Florin -	19	Lascelles (Hon. G.) -	10, 11	Pembroke (Earl of) -	12	Sully (James) -	15
Follett (M. P.) -	4	Laurie (S. S.) -	5	Perrin (Sir P.) -	19	Supernatural Religion	
Ford (H.) -	13	Leaf (Walter) -	31	Phillips (M.) -	32	(Author of) -	32
Fowler (Edith H.) -	21	Lear (H. L. Sidney) -	29	Phillips-Wolley (C.) -	10, 22	Sutherland (A. and G.) -	6
Francis (Francis) -	13	Lecky (W. E. H.) -	5, 19	Piatt (S. & J. J.) -	20	Suttner (B. von) -	23
Freeman (Edward A.) -	4	Lees (J. A.) -	9	Pleydell-Bouverie (E. O.) -	12	Swinburne (A. J.) -	15
Frothingham (A. L.) -	30	Lester (L. V.) -	7	Pole (W.) -	13	Symes (J. E.) -	17
Froude (James A.) 4, 7, 9, 21		Lewes (G. H.) -	15	Pollock (W. H.) -	11		
Furieux (W.) -	24	Lindley (J.) -	25	Poole (W. H. and		Tacitus -	18
		Lindsay (Lady) -	19	Mrs.) -	29	Taylor (Meadows) -	17
Galton (W. F.) -	17	Lodge (H. C.) -	4	Poore (G. V.) -	31	Tebbutt (C. G.) -	12
Gardiner (Samuel R.) -	4	Lofie (Rev. W. J.) -	4	Potter (J.) -	16	Thompson (N. G.) -	13
Gerard (D.) -	26	Longman (C. J.) 10, 13, 30		Prevost (C.) -	11	Thornhill (W. J.) -	18
Gibbons (J. S.) -	11, 12	— (F. W.) -	13	Pritchett (R. T.) -	12	Todd (A.) -	6
Gibson (Hon. H.) -	13	— (G. H.) -	11, 12	Proctor (R. A.) -	13, 24, 31	Toynbee (A.) -	17
Gill (H. J.) -	22	Lowell (A. L.) -	5			Trevelyan (Sir G. O.) -	7
Gleig (Rev. G. R.) -	8	Lubbock (Sir John) -	17	Quill (A. W.) -	18	— (C. P.) -	17
Goethe -	19	Lucan -	18	Quillinan (Mrs.) -	9	Trollope (Anthony) -	23
Graham (P. A.) -	13, 21	Lyall (Edna) -	22	Quintana (A.) -	22	Tyndall (J.) -	9
— (G. F.) -	16	Lytelton (Hon. R. H.) -	10			Tyrrill (R. Y.) -	18
Grant (Sir A.) -	14	Lytton (Earl of) -	19				
Graves (R. P.) -	14			Raine (Rev. James) -	4	Upton (F. K. and	
Green (T. Hill) -	14	MacArthur (Miss E. A.) 17		Ransome (Cyril) -	3	Bertha) -	26
Greville (C. C. F.) -	4	Macaulay (Lord) 5, 6, 20		Rhoades (J.) -	18, 20		
Grey (Maria) -	26	MacColl (Canon) -	6	Rhoscomyl (O.) -	23	Verney (Frances P.	
Grose (T. H.) -	14	MacDonald (George) 20, 32		Rich (A.) -	18	and Margaret M.) -	8
Grove (F. C.) -	11	Macfarren (Sir G. A.) -	30	Richardson (Sir B. W.) -	31	Vincent (J. E.) -	17
— (Mrs. Lilly) -	11	Magruder (Julia) -	22	— (C.) -	12	Virgil -	18
Gurney (Rev. A.) -	19	Mackail (J. W.) -	18	Richman (I. B.) -	6	Vivekananda (Swami)	32
Gwilt (J.) -	30	Mackinnon (J.) -	6	Rickaby (John) -	16		
Haggard (H. Rider)	21	Macleod (H. D.) -	16	— (Joseph) -	16	Wakeman (H. O.) -	6
Hake (O.) -	12	Macpherson (Rev. H. A.) 12		Ridley (Annie E.) -	7	Walford (Mrs.) -	23
Halliwell-Phillips (J.) -	8	Maher (M.) -	16	— (E.) -	18	Walker (Jane H.) -	29
Hamlin (A. D. F.) -	30	Malleson (Col. G. B.) -	5	Riley (J. W.) -	20	Walpole (Spencer) -	6
Harding (S. B.) -	4	Mandello (J.) -	17	Roget (Peter M.) -	16, 25	Walrond (Col. H.) -	10
Hart (Albert B.) -	4	Marbot (Baron de) -	7	Rokeby (C.) -	23	Walsingham (Lord) -	11
Harte (Bret) -	22	Marquand (A.) -	30	Rolsen (N.) -	7	Walter (J.) -	8
Hartwig (G.) -	24	Marshman (J. C.) -	7	Romanes (G. J.) -	8, 15, 17, 20, 32	Watson (A. E. T.) -	11, 12
Hassall (A.) -	6	Martineau (Dr. James) 32		— (Mrs.) -	8	Waylen (H. S. H.) -	30
Haweis (Rev. H. R.) 7, 30		Maskelyne (J. N.) -	13	Ronalds (A.) -	13	Webb (Mr. and Mrs.	
Hayward (Jane M.) -	24	Matthews (Brander) -	22	Roosevelt (T.) -	4	Sidney) -	17
Hearn (W. E.) -	9	Mauder (S.) -	25	Rossetti (M. F.) -	31	— (T. E.) -	19
Heathcote (J. M. and	12	Max Müller (F.) -	15, 16, 30, 32	Russell (Bertrand) -	17	Weber (A.) -	15
C. G.) -	12					Weir (Capt. R.) -	11
Helmholtz (Hermann		May (Sir T. Erskine) -	6	Saintsbury (G.) -	12	West (B. B.) -	23, 31
von) -	24	Meade (L. T.) -	26	Sanders (T. C.) -	14	Weyman (Stanley) -	23
Henry (W.) -	12	Melville (G. J. Whyte) -	22	Seebom (F.) -	6, 8	Whately (Archbishop) 14, 15	
Herbert (Col. Kenney)	12	Merivale (Dean) -	6	Selous (F. C.) -	10	— (E. Jane) -	16
Hewins (W. A. S.) -	17	Merriman (H. S.) -	22	Selss (A. M.) -	19	Whishaw (F. J.) -	9, 23
Hillier (G. Lacy) -	10	Mill (James) -	15	Sewell (Elizabeth M.) -	23	Whitelaw (R.) -	18
Hodgson (Shadworth H.) -	14	— (John Stuart) -	15, 16	Shakespeare -	20	Wilcocks (J. C.) -	13
Holroyd (Maria J.) -	7	Miss Molly (Author of)	30	Shand (A. I.) -	12	Willich (C. M.) -	25
Holroyd (Maria J.) -	7	Molesworth (Mrs.) -	26	Sharpe (R. R.) -	12	Witham (T. M.) -	12
Hope (Anthony) -	22	Montague (F. C.) -	6	Shearman (M.) -	10	Wolff (H. W.) -	6
Hornung (E. W.) -	22	Moore (T.) -	25	Sheppard (Rev. Edgar) -	10	Wood (Rev. J. G.) -	25
Houston (D. F.) -	4	— (Rev. Edward) -	25	Sinclair (A.) -	12	Woodgate (W. B.) -	10
Howell (G.) -	16	Morris (W.) -	20, 22, 31	Smith (R. Bosworth)	6	Wood-Martin (W. G.) -	6
Howitt (W.) -	9	— (Mowbray) -	11	— (W. P. Haskett) -	9	Wordsworth (Elizabeth) 26	
Hudson (W. H.) -	24	Mosso (A.) -	15	Soderini (Count E.) -	17	Wylie (J. H.) -	6
Hueffer (F. M.) -	7	Mulhall (M. G.) -	17	Solovyoff (V. S.) -	31		
Hume (David) -	14	Munk (W.) -	7	Sophocles -	18	Youatt (W.) -	10
Hunt (Rev. W.) -	14	Murray (K. F.) -	20	Soulsby (Lucy H.) -	26		
Hutchinson (Horace G.) 11						Zeller (E.) -	15
Ingelw (Jean) -	19, 26						

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.

Abbott.—*A HISTORY OF GREECE*
By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D.

Part I.—From the Earliest Times to the
Ionian Revolt. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part II.—500-445 B.C. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Acland and Ransome.—*A HANDBOOK IN OUTLINE OF THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND TO 1894*. Chronologically Arranged. By A. H. DYKE ACLAND, M.P., and CYRIL RANSOME, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

ANNUAL REGISTER (THE). A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad, for the year 1895. 8vo., 18s.

Volumes of the *ANNUAL REGISTER* for the years 1863-1894 can still be had. 18s. each.

Arnold (THOMAS, [D.D.], formerly Head Master of Rugby School.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Baden-Powell.—*THE INDIAN VILLAGE COMMUNITY*. Examined with Reference to the Physical, Ethnographic, and Historical Conditions of the Provinces; chiefly on the Basis of the Revenue Settlement Records and District Manuals. By B. H. BADEN-POWELL, M.A., C.I.E. With Map. 8vo., 16s.

Bagwell.—*IRELAND UNDER THE TUDORS*. By RICHARD BAGWELL, LL.D. (3 vols.) Vols. I. and II. From the first invasion of the Northmen to the year 1578. 8vo., 32s. Vol. III. 1578-1603. 8vo. 18s.

Ball.—*HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEMS OPERATIVE IN IRELAND*, from the Invasion of Henry the Second to the Union (1172-1800). By the Rt. Hon. J. T. BALL. 8vo., 6s.

Besant.—*THE HISTORY OF LONDON*. By Sir WALTER BESANT. With 74 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 1s. 9d. Or bound as a School Prize Book, 2s. 6d.

Brassey (LORD).—PAPERS AND ADDRESSES.

NAVAL AND MARITIME. 1872-1893. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10s.

Brassey (LORD) PAPERS AND ADDRESSES—continued.

MERCANTILE MARINE AND NAVIGATION, from 1871-1894. Crown 8vo., 5s.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION AND COLONISATION FROM 1880 to 1894. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

POLITICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS. 1861-1894. Crown 8vo 5s.

Bright.—*A HISTORY OF ENGLAND*. By the Rev. J. FRANCK BRIGHT, D.D.

Period I. *MEDIÆVAL MONARCHY: A.D.* 449 to 1485. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Period II. *PERSONAL MONARCHY.* 1485 to 1688. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Period III. *CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY.* 1689 to 1837. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Period IV. *THE GROWTH OF DEMOCRACY.* 1837 to 1880. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Buckle.—*HISTORY OF CIVILISATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE, SPAIN AND SCOTLAND*. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 24s.

Burke.—*A HISTORY OF SPAIN* from the Earliest Times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic. By ULICK RALPH BURKE, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo., 32s.

Chesney.—*INDIAN POLITY: a View of the System of Administration in India*. By General Sir GEORGE CHESNEY, K.C.B., With Map showing all the Administrative Divisions of British India. 8vo., 21s.

Cunningham.—*A SCHEME FOR IMPERIAL FEDERATION: a Senate for the Empire*. By GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM, of Montreal, Canada. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Curzon.—*PERSIA AND THE PERSIAN QUESTION*. By the Right Hon. GEORGE N. CURZON, M.P. With 9 Maps, 95 Illustrations, Appendices, and an Index. 2 vols. 8vo., 42s.

De Tocqueville.—*DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA*. By ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Dickinson.—*THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARLIAMENT DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.* By G. LOWES DICKINSON, M.A. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Ewald.—*THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL.* By HEINRICH EWALD. 8 vols., 8vo., £5 18s.

Follett.—*THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.* By M. P. FOLLETT. With an Introduction by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Ph.D., of Harvard University. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Froude (JAMES A.).

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.

Popular Edition. 12 vols. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

'Silver Library' Edition. 12 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

THE DIVORCE OF CATHERINE OF ARAGON. Crown 8vo., 6s.

THE SPANISH STORY OF THE ARMADA, and other Essays. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Cabinet Edition. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 18s.

'Silver Library' Edition. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ENGLISH SEAMEN IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. Crown 8vo., 6s.

SHORT STUDIES ON GREAT SUBJECTS. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

CÆSAR: a Sketch. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Gardiner (SAMUEL RAWSON, D.C.L., LL.D.).

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each.

A HISTORY OF THE GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642-1649. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 6s. each.

A HISTORY OF THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE PROTECTORATE. 1649-1660. Vol. I. 1649-1651. With 14 Maps. 8vo., 21s.

Gardiner (SAMUEL RAWSON, D.C.L., LL.D.)—continued.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. With 378 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 12s.

Also in Three Volumes, price 4s. each.

Vol. I. B.C. 55—A.D. 1509. 173 Illustrations.

Vol. II. 1509-1689. 96 Illustrations.

Vol. III. 1689-1885. 109 Illustrations.

Greville.—*A JOURNAL OF THE REIGNS OF KING GEORGE IV., KING WILLIAM IV., AND QUEEN VICTORIA.* By CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, formerly Clerk of the Council.

Cabinet Edition. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each.

'Silver Library' Edition. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

HARVARD HISTORICAL STUDIES.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1638-1870. By W. E. B. DUBOIS, Ph.D. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

THE CONTEST OVER THE RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION IN MASSACHUSETTS. By S. B. HARDING, A.M. 8vo., 6s.

A CRITICAL STUDY OF NULLIFICATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA. By D. F. HOUSTON, A.M. 8vo., 6s.

* * Other Volumes are in preparation.

Hearn.—*THE GOVERNMENT OF ENGLAND: its Structure and its Development.* By W. EDWARD HEARN. 8vo., 16s.

Historic Towns.—Edited by E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., and Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. With Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

Bristol. By Rev. W. Hunt.	Oxford. By Rev. C. W. Boase.
Carlisle. By Mandell Creighton, D.D.	Winchester. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D.
Cinque Ports. By Montague Burrows.	York. By Rev. James Raine.
Colchester. By Rev. E. L. Cutts.	New York. By Theodore Roosevelt.
Exeter. By E. A. Freeman.	Boston (U.S.). By Henry Cabot Lodge.
London. By Rev. W. J. Loftie.	

Joyce.—*A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND*, from the Earliest Times to 1608. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Kaye and Malleison.—‘*HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY, 1857-1858*’. By Sir JOHN W. KAYE and Colonel G. B. MALLEISON. With Analytical Index and Maps and Plans. Cabinet Edition. 6 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each.

Knight.—*MADAGASCAR IN WAR TIME: THE EXPERIENCES OF ‘THE TIMES’ SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT WITH THE HOVAS DURING THE FRENCH INVASION OF 1895*. By E. F. KNIGHT. With 16 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Lang (ANDREW).

PICKLE THE SPY: or, The Incognito of Prince Charles. With 6 Portraits. 8vo., 18s.

ST. ANDREWS. With 8 Plates and 24 Illustrations in the Text by T. HODGE. 8vo., 15s. net.

Laurie.—*HISTORICAL SURVEY OF PRE-CHRISTIAN EDUCATION*. By S. S. LAURIE, A.M., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 12s.

Lecky (WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE). *HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*.

Library Edition. 8 vols. 8vo., £7 4s.

Cabinet Edition. ENGLAND. 7 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each. IRELAND. 5 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each.

HISTORY OF EUROPEAN MORALS FROM AUGUSTUS TO CHARLEMAGNE. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s.

HISTORY OF THE RISE AND INFLUENCE OF THE SPIRIT OF RATIONALISM IN EUROPE. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16s.

DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.

THE EMPIRE: its value and its Growth. An Inaugural Address delivered at the Imperial Institute, November 20, 1893. Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

Lowell.—*GOVERNMENTS AND PARTIES IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE*. By A. LAWRENCE LOWELL. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

Macaulay (LORD).

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF LORD MACAULAY. ‘Edinburgh’ Edition. 10 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

Vols. I.-IV. *HISTORY OF ENGLAND*.

Vols. V.-VII. *ESSAYS; BIOGRAPHIES; INDIAN PENAL CODE; CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNIGHT’S ‘QUARTERLY MAGAZINE’*.

Vol. VIII. *SPEECHES; LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME; MISCELLANEOUS POEMS*.

Vols. IX. and X. *THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY*. By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart., M.P.

This Edition is a cheaper reprint of the Library Edition of LORD MACAULAY’S Life and Works.

COMPLETE WORKS.

Cabinet Edition. 16 vols. Post 8vo., £4 16s.

Library Edition. 8 vols. 8vo., £5 5s. ‘Edinburgh’ Edition. 8 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND.

Popular Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

Student’s Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 12s.

People’s Edition. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 16s.

Cabinet Edition. 8 vols. Post 8vo., 48s. ‘Edinburgh’ Edition. 4 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

Library Edition. 5 vols. 8vo., £4.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS, WITH LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, in 1 volume.

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Authorised Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d., or 3s. 6d., gilt edges.

Silver Library Edition. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS.

Student’s Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

People’s Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 8s.

‘Trevelyan’ Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 9s.

Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24s.

‘Edinburgh’ Edition. 4 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

Library Edition. 3 vols. 8vo., 36s.

ESSAYS which may be had separately price 6d. each sewed, 1s. each cloth.

Addison and Walpole.
Croker’s Boswell’s Johnson.
Hallam’s Constitutional History.
Warren Hastings.
The Earl of Chatham (Two Essays).
Frederick the Great.

Ranke and Gladstone.
Milton and Machiavelli.
Lord Byron.
Lord Clive.
Lord Byron, and The Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS

People’s Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—continued.

Macaulay (LORD)—continued.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS AND SPEECHES.

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Cabinet Edition. Including Indian Penal Code, Lays of Ancient Rome, and Miscellaneous Poems. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF LORD MACAULAY. Edited, with Occasional Notes, by the Right Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart. Crown 8vo., 6s.

MacColl.—*THE SULTAN AND THE POWERS.* By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon of Ripon. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Mackinnon.—*THE UNION OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND: A STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL HISTORY.* By JAMES MACKINNON. Ph.D. Examiner in History to the University of Edinburgh. 8vo., 16s.

May.—*THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND* since the Accession of George III. 1760-1870. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. (Lord Farnborough). 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 18s.

Merivale (THE LATE DEAN).

HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC: A Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. 12mo., 7s. 6d.

Montague.—*THE ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.* By F. C. MONTAGUE, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

O'Brien.—*IRISH IDEAS. REPRINTED ADDRESSES.* By WILLIAM O'BRIEN. Cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Richman.—*APPENZELL: PURE DEMOCRACY AND PASTORAL LIFE IN INNER-RHODEN.* A Swiss Study. By IRVING B. RICHMAN, Consul-General of the United States to Switzerland. With Maps. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Seeböhm (FREDERIC).

THE ENGLISH VILLAGE COMMUNITY Examined in its Relations to the Manorial and Tribal Systems, &c. With 13 Maps and Plates. 8vo., 16s.

THE TRIBAL SYSTEM IN WALES: Being Part of an Inquiry into the Structure and Methods of Tribal Society. With 3 Maps. 8vo., 12s.

Sharpe.—*LONDON AND THE KINGDOM:* a History derived mainly from the Archives at Guildhall in the custody of the Corporation of the City of London. By REGINALD R. SHARPE, D.C.L., Records Clerk in the Office of the Town Clerk of the City of London. 3 vols. 8vo. 10s. 6d. each.

Sheppard.—*MEMORIALS OF ST. JAMES'S PALACE.* By the Rev. EDGAR SHEPPARD, M.A., Sub-Dean of H.M. Chapels Royal. With 41 Full-page Plates (8 Photo-Intaglio) and 32 Illustrations in the Text. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s. net.

Smith.—*CARTHAGE AND THE CARTHAGINIANS.* By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A., With Maps, Plans, &c. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Stephens.—*A HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.* By H. MORSE STEPHENS. 3 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 18s. each.

Stubbs.—*HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN*, from its Foundation to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By J. W. STUBBS. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Sutherland.—*THE HISTORY OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND*, from 1606 to 1890. By ALEXANDER SUTHERLAND, M.A., and GEORGE SUTHERLAND, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Taylor.—*A STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF INDIA.* By Colonel MEADOWS TAYLOR, C.S.I., &c. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Todd.—*PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.* By ALPHEUS TODD, LL.D. 8vo., 30s. net.

Wakeman and Hassall.—*ESSAYS INTRODUCTORY TO THE STUDY OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.* By Resident Members of the University of Oxford. Edited by HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A., and ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Walpole.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE CONCLUSION OF THE GREAT WAR IN 1815 TO 1858.* By SPENCER WALPOLE. 6 vols. Crown 8vo., 6s. each.

Wolff.—*ODD BITS OF HISTORY:* being Short Chapters intended to Fill Some Blanks. By HENRY W. WOLFF. 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Wood-Martin.—*PAGAN IRELAND: AN ARCHÆOLOGICAL SKETCH.* A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Antiquities. By W. G. WOOD-MARTIN, M.R.I.A. With 512 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 15s.

Wylie.—*HISTORY OF ENGLAND UNDER HENRY IV.* By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A., one of H. M. Inspectors of Schools. 3 vols. Crown 8vo. Vol. I., 1399-1404, 10s. 6d. Vol. II., 15s. Vol. III., 15s. [Vol. IV. In the press]

Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.

Armstrong.—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF EDMUND J. ARMSTRONG.* Edited by G. F. ARMSTRONG. Fcp. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Bacon.—*THE LETTERS AND LIFE OF FRANCIS BACON, INCLUDING ALL HIS OCCASIONAL WORKS.* Edited by JAMES SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4s.

Bagehot.—*BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Blackwell.—*PIONEER WORK IN OPENING THE MEDICAL PROFESSION TO WOMEN: Autobiographical Sketches.* By Dr. ELIZABETH BLACKWELL. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Boyd (A. K. H.) ('A.K.H.B.').
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF ST. ANDREWS. 1865-1890. 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 12s. Vol. II. 15s.

ST. ANDREWS AND ELSEWHERE: Glimpses of Some Gone and of Things Left. 8vo., 15s.

THE LAST YEARS OF ST. ANDREWS: SEPTEMBER 1890 TO SEPTEMBER 1895. 8vo., 15s.

Brown.—*FORD MADOX BROWN: A Record of his Life and Works.* By FORD M. HUEFFER. With 45 Full-page Plates (22 Autotypes) and 7 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 42s.

Buss.—*FRANCES MARY BUSS AND HER WORK FOR EDUCATION.* By ANNIE E. RIDLEY. With 5 Portraits and 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Carlyle.—*THOMAS CARLYLE: A History of his Life.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.
1795-1835. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.
1834-1881. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.

Digby.—*THE LIFE OF SIR KENELM DIGBY, by one of his Descendants, the Author of 'The Life of a Conspirator,' 'A Life of Archbishop Laud,' etc.* With 7 Illustrations. 8vo., 16s.

Erasmus.—*LIFE AND LETTERS OF ERASMUS.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE. Crown 8vo.

Fox.—*THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHARLES JAMES FOX.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart.
Library Edition. 8vo., 18s.
Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Halford.—*THE LIFE OF SIR HENRY HALFORD, BART., G.C.H., M.D., F.R.S.,* By WILLIAM MUNK, M.D., F.S.A. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Hamilton.—*LIFE OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON.* By R. P. GRAVES. 8vo. 3 vols. 15s. each. ADDENDUM. 8vo., 6d. sewed.

Harper.—*A MEMOIR OF HUGO DANIEL HARPER, D.D.,* late Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, and for many years Head Master of Sherborne School. By L. V. LESTER, M.A. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Havelock.—*MEMOIRS OF SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, K.C.B.* By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Haweis.—*MY MUSICAL LIFE.* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS. With Portrait of Richard Wagner and 3 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Holroyd.—*THE GIRLHOOD OF MARIA JOSEPHA HOLROYD (Lady Stanley of Alderley).* Recorded in Letters of a Hundred Years Ago, from 1776 to 1796. Edited by J. H. ADEANE. With 6 Portraits. 8vo., 18s.

Luther.—*LIFE OF LUTHER.* By JULIUS KÖSTLIN. With Illustrations from Authentic Sources. Translated from the German. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Macaulay.—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart., M.P.
Popular Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
Student's Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
Cabinet Edition. 2 vols. Post 8vo., 12s.
Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.
'Edinburgh' Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.

Marbot.—*THE MEMOIRS OF THE BARON DE MARBOT.* Translated from the French. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Nansen.—*FRIDTIOF NANSEN, 1861-1893.* By W. C. BRÖGGER and NORDAHL ROLFSSEN. Translated by WILLIAM ARCHER. With 8 Plates, 48 Illustrations in the Text, and 3 Maps. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Romanes.—*THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.* Written and Edited by his WIFE. With Portrait and 2 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Seebohm.—*THE OXFORD REFORMERS*—JOHN COLET, ERASMUS AND THOMAS MORE: a History of their Fellow-Work. By FREDERIC SEEBOHM. 8vo., 14s.

Shakespeare.—*OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF SHAKESPEARE.* By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPS. With Illustrations and Fac-similes. 2 vols. Royal 8vo., £1 1s.

Shakespeare's TRUE LIFE. By JAMES WALTER. With 500 Illustrations by GERALD E. MOIRA. Imp. 8vo., 21s.

Stephen.—*ESSAYS IN ECCLESIASTICAL BIOGRAPHY.* By Sir JAMES STEPHEN. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Turgot.—*THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF TURGOT*, Comptroller-General of France, 1774-1776. Edited for English Readers by W. WALKER STEPHENS. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Verney.—*MEMOIRS OF THE VERNEY FAMILY.*

Vols. I. & II., *DURING THE CIVIL WAR.* By FRANCES PARTHENOPE VERNEY. With 38 Portraits, Woodcuts and Fac-simile. Royal 8vo., 42s.

Vol. III., *DURING THE COMMONWEALTH.* 1650-1660. By MARGARET M. VERNEY. With 10 Portraits, &c. Royal 8vo., 21s.

Wellington.—*LIFE OF THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON.* By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Wolf.—*THE LIFE OF JOSEPH WOLF, ANIMAL PAINTER.* By A. H. PALMER. With 53 Plates and 14 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 21s.

Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.

Arnold (SIR EDWIN).

SEAS AND LANDS. With 71 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

WANDERING WORDS. With 45 Illustrations. 8vo., 18s.

EAST AND WEST: With 14 Illustrations by R. T. PRITCHETT. 8vo., 18s.

AUSTRALIA AS IT IS, or Facts and Features, Sketches, and Incidents of Australia and Australian Life with Notices of New Zealand. By A CLERGYMAN, thirteen years resident in the interior of New South Wales. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Baker (SIR S. W.).

EIGHT YEARS IN CEYLON. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE RIFLE AND THE HOUND IN CEYLON. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Bent (J. THEODORE).

THE RUINED CITIES OF MASHONALAND: being a Record of Excavation and Exploration in 1891. With 117 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Bent (J. THEODORE)—*continued.*

THE SACRED CITY OF THE ETHIOPIANS: being a Record of Travel and Research in Abyssinia in 1893. With 8 Plates and 65 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Bicknell.—*TRAVEL AND ADVENTURE IN NORTHERN QUEENSLAND.* By ARTHUR C. BICKNELL. With 24 Plates and 22 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 15s.

Brassey.—*VOYAGES AND TRAVELS OF LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B., D.C.L., 1862-1894.* Arranged and Edited by Captain S. EARDLEY-WILMOT. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10s.

Brassey (THE LATE LADY).

A VOYAGE IN THE 'SUNBEAM'; OUR HOME ON THE OCEAN FOR ELEVEN MONTHS.

Library Edition. With 8 Maps and Charts, and 118 Illustrations. 8vo. 21s.

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Silver Library Edition. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 60 Illustrations. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

School Edition. With 37 Illustrations. Fcp., 2s. cloth, or 3s. white parchment.

Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.—*continued.*

Brassey (THE LATE LADY)—*continued.*

SUNSHINE AND STORM IN THE EAST.

Library Edition. With 2 Maps and 141 Illustrations. 8vo., 21s.

Cabinet Edition. With 2 Maps and 114 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 103 Illustrations. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

IN THE TRADES, THE TROPICS, AND THE 'ROARING FORTIES.'

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 220 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Popular Edition. With 183 Illustrations. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THREE VOYAGES IN THE 'SUNBEAM'.

Popular Ed. With 346 Illust. 4to., 2s. 6d.

Browning.—*A GIRL'S WANDERINGS IN HUNGARY.* By H. ELLEN BROWNING. With Map and 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Froude (JAMES A.).

OCEANA: or England and her Colonies. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

THE ENGLISH IN THE WEST INDIES: or, the Bow of Ulysses. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

Howitt.—*VISITS TO REMARKABLE PLACES.* Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes, illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By WILLIAM HOWITT. With 80 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Knight (E. F.).

THE CRUISE OF THE 'ALERTE': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad. With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

WHERE THREE EMPIRES MEET: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Baltistan, Ladak, Gilgit, and the adjoining Countries. With a Map and 54 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE 'FALCON' ON THE BALTIC: a Voyage from London to Copenhagen in a Three-Tonner. With 19 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Lees and Clutterbuck.—B.C. 1887: *A RAMBLE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.* By J. A. LEES and W. J. CLUTTERBUCK. With Map and 75 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Nansen (FRIDTJOF).

THE FIRST CROSSING OF GREENLAND. With numerous Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

ESKIMO LIFE. With 31 Illustrations. 8vo., 16s.

Oliver.—*CRAGS AND CRATERS:* Rambles in the Island of Réunion. By WILLIAM DUDLEY OLIVER, M.A. With 27 Illustrations and a Map. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Peary.—*MY ARCTIC JOURNAL:* a year among Ice-Fields and Eskimos. By JOSEPHINE DIEBITSCH-PEARY. With 19 Plates, 3 Sketch Maps, and 44 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 12s.

Quillinan.—*JOURNAL OF A FEW MONTHS' RESIDENCE IN PORTUGAL,* and Glimpses of the South of Spain. By Mrs. QUILLINAN (Dora Wordsworth). New Edition. Edited, with Memoir, by EDMUND LEE, Author of 'Dorothy Wordsworth,' &c. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Smith.—*CLIMBING IN THE BRITISH ISLES.* By W. P. HASKETT SMITH. With Illustrations by ELLIS CARR, and Numerous Plans.

Part I. *ENGLAND.* 16mo., 3s. 6d.

Part II. *WALES AND IRELAND.* 16mo., 3s. 6d.

Part III. *SCOTLAND.* [In preparation.]

Stephen.—*THE PLAY-GROUND OF EUROPE.* By LESLIE STEPHEN. New Edition, with Additions and 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

THREE IN NORWAY. By Two of Them. With a Map and 59 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s. boards, 2s. 6d. cloth.

Tyndall.—*THE GLACIERS OF THE ALPS:* being a Narrative of Excursions and Ascents. An Account of the Origin and Phenomena of Glaciers, and an Exposition of the Physical Principles to which they are related. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

Whishaw.—*THE ROMANCE OF THE WOODS:* Reprinted Articles and Sketches. By FRED. J. WHISHAW. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Veterinary Medicine, &c.

Steel (JOHN HENRY).

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE DOG. With 88 Illustrations. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE OX. With 119 Illustrations. 8vo., 15s.

A TREATISE ON THE DISEASES OF THE SHEEP. With 100 Illustrations. 8vo., 12s.

OUTLINES OF EQUINE ANATOMY: a Manual for the use of Veterinary Students in the Dissecting Room. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Fitzwygram. — *HORSES AND STABLES.* By Major-General Sir F. FITZWYGRAM, Bart. With 56 pages of Illustrations. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

'Stonehenge.' — *THE DOG IN HEALTH AND DISEASE.* By 'STONEHENGE'. With 78 Wood Engravings. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Youatt (WILLIAM).

THE HORSE. Revised and Enlarged by W. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S. With 52 Wood Engravings. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

THE DOG. Revised and Enlarged. With 33 Wood Engravings. 8vo., 6s.

Sport and Pastime.

THE BADMINTON LIBRARY.

Edited by HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G.; Assisted by ALFRED E. T. WATSON.

Complete in 28 Volumes. Crown 8vo., Price 10s. 6d. each Volume, Cloth.

* * *The Volumes are also issued half-bound in Leather, with gilt top. The price can be had from all Booksellers.*

ARCHERY. By C. J. LONGMAN and Col. H. WALROND. With Contributions by Miss LEIGH, Viscount DILLON, Major C. HAWKINS FISHER, &c. With 2 Maps, 23 Plates and 172 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ATHLETICS AND FOOTBALL. By MONTAGUE SHEARMAN. With 6 Plates and 52 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

BIG GAME SHOOTING. By CLIVE PHILLIPPS-WOLLEY.

Vol. I. AFRICA AND AMERICA. With Contributions by Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, W. C. OSWELL, F. J. JACKSON, WARBURTON PIKE, and F. C. SELOUS. With 20 Plates and 57 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. EUROPE, ASIA, AND THE ARCTIC REGIONS. With Contributions by Lieut.-Colonel R. HEBER PERCY, ARNOLD PIKE, Major ALGERNON C. HEBER PERCY, &c. With 17 Plates and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

BILLIARDS. By Major W. BROADFOOT, R.E. With Contributions by A. H. BOYD, SYDENHAM DIXON, W. J. FORD, DUDLEY D. PONTIFEX, &c. With 11 Plates, 19 Illustrations in the Text, and numerous Diagrams and Figures. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

BOATING. By W. B. WOODGATE. With 10 Plates, 39 Illustrations in the Text, and from Instantaneous Photographs, and 4 Maps of the Rowing Courses at Oxford, Cambridge, Henley, and Putney. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

COURSING AND FALCONRY. By HARDING COX and the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES. With 20 Plates and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

CRICKET. By A. G. STEEL and the Hon. R. H. LYTTELTON. With Contributions by ANDREW LANG, W. G. GRACE, F. GALE, &c. With 12 Plates and 52 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*THE BADMINTON LIBRARY—*continued.*

CYCLING. By the EARL OF ALBEMARLE and G. LACY HILLIER. With 19 Plates and 44 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

DANCING. By Mrs. LILLY GROVE, F.R.G.S. With Contributions by Miss MIDDLETON, The Hon. Mrs. ARMYTAGE, &c. With Musical Examples, and 38 Full-page Plates and 93 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

DRIVING. By His Grace the DUKE of BEAUFORT, K.G. With Contributions by other Authorities. With Photogravure Intaglio Portrait of His Grace the DUKE of BEAUFORT, and 11 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

FENCING, BOXING, AND WRESTLING. By WALTER H. POLLOCK, F. C. GROVE, C. PREVOST, E. B. MITCHELL, and WALTER ARMSTRONG. With 18 Intaglio Plates and 24 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

FISHING. By H. CHOLMONDELEY-PENNELL, Late Her Majesty's Inspector of Sea Fisheries.

Vol. I. SALMON AND TROUT. With Contributions by H. R. FRANCIS, Major JOHN P. TRAHERNE, &c. With Frontispiece, 8 Full-page Illustrations of Fishing Subjects, and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, &c. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. PIKE AND OTHER COARSE FISH. With Contributions by the MARQUIS OF EXETER, WILLIAM SENIOR, G. CHRISTOPHER DAVIS, &c. With Frontispiece, 6 Full-page Illustrations of Fishing Subjects, and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, &c. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

GOLF. By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. With Contributions by the Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., Sir WALTER SIMPSON, Bart., ANDREW LANG, &c. With 25 Plates and 65 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

HUNTING. By His Grace the DUKE of BEAUFORT, K.G., and MOWBRAY MORRIS. With Contributions by the EARL OF SUFFOLK and BERKSHIRE, Rev. E. W. L. DAVIES, J. S. GIBBONS, G. H. LONGMAN, &c. With 5 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

MOUNTAINEERING. By C. T. DENT. With Contributions by Sir W. M. CONWAY, D. W. FRESHFIELD, C. E. MATTHEWS, &c. With 13 Plates and 95 Illustrations in the Text. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

POETRY OF SPORT (THE).—Selected by HEDLEY PEEK. With a Chapter on Classical Allusions to Sport by ANDREW LANG, and a Special Preface to the Badminton Library by A. E. T. WATSON. With 32 Plates and 74 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

RACING AND STEEPLE-CHASING. By the EARL OF SUFFOLK and BERKSHIRE, W. G. CRAVEN, the Hon. F. LAWLEY, ARTHUR COVENTRY, and ALFRED E. T. WATSON. With Coloured Frontispiece and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

RIDING AND POLO.

RIDING. By Captain ROBERT WEIR, the DUKE OF BEAUFORT, the EARL OF SUFFOLK and BERKSHIRE, the EARL OF ONSLOW, J. MURRAY BROWN, &c. With 18 Plates and 41 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

SEA FISHING. By JOHN BICKERDYKE, Sir H. W. GORE-BOOTH, ALFRED C. HARMSWORTH, and W. SENIOR. With 22 Full-page Plates and 175 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

SHOOTING.

Vol. I. FIELD AND COVERT. By LORD WALSHINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES and A. J. STUART-WORTLEY. With 11 Full-page Illustrations and 94 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. MOOR AND MARSH. By LORD WALSHINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by LORD LOVAT and Lord CHARLES LENNOX KERR. With 8 Full-page Illustrations and 57 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

THE BADMINTON LIBRARY—*continued.*

SKATING, CURLING, TOBOGGANING. By J. M. HEATHCOTE, C. G. Tebbutt, T. Maxwell Witham, Rev. John Kerr, Ormond Hake, Henry A. Buck, &c. With 12 Plates and 272 Illustrations and Diagrams in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

SWIMMING. By ARCHIBALD SINCLAIR and WILLIAM HENRY, Hon. Secs. of the Life-Saving Society. With 13 Plates and 106 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

TENNIS, LAWN TENNIS, RACKETS AND FIVES. By J. M. and C. G. HEATHCOTE, E. O. PLEYDELL-BOUVERIE, and A. C. AINGER. With Contributions by the Hon. A. LYTTETON, W. C. MARSHALL, Miss L. Dod, &c. With 12 Plates and 67 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

YACHTING.

Vol. I. **CRUISING, CONSTRUCTION OF YACHTS, YACHT RACING RULES, FITTING-OUT,** &c. By Sir EDWARD SULLIVAN, Bart., THE EARL OF PEMBROKE, LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B., C. E. SETH-SMITH, C.B., G. L. WATSON, R. T. PRITCHETT, E. F. KNIGHT, &c. With 21 Plates and 93 Illustrations in the Text, and from Photographs. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Vol. II. **YACHT CLUBS, YACHTING IN AMERICA AND THE COLONIES, YACHT RACING,** &c. By R. T. PRITCHETT, THE MARQUIS OF DUFFERIN and AWA, K.P., THE EARL OF ONSLOW, JAMES McFERRAN, &c. With 35 Plates and 160 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

FUR AND FEATHER SERIES.

Edited by A. E. T. WATSON.

Crown 8vo., price 5s. each Volume, cloth.

* * *The Volumes are also issued half-bound in Leather, with gilt top. The price can be had from all Booksellers.*

THE PARTRIDGE. Natural History by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY; Cookery, by GEORGE SAINTSBURY. With 11 Illustrations and various Diagrams in the Text. Crown 8vo., 5s.

THE GROUSE. Natural History by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY; Cookery, by GEORGE SAINTSBURY. With 13 Illustrations and various Diagrams in the Text. Crown 8vo., 5s.

THE PHEASANT. Natural History by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by A. J. STUART-WORTLEY; Cookery, by ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 10 Illustrations and various Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5s.

THE HARE. Natural History by the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON; Shooting, by the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES; Coursing, by CHARLES RICHARDSON; Hunting, by J. S. GIBBONS and G. H. LONGMAN; Cookery, by Col. KENNEY HERBERT. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

RED DEER.—Natural History. By the Rev. H. A. MACPHERSON. Deer Stalking. By CAMERON OF LOCHIEL.—Stag Hunting. By Viscount EBRINGTON.—Cookery. By ALEXANDER INNES SHAND. With 10 Illustrations by J. CHARLTON and A. THORBURN. Crown 8vo., 5s.

* * *Other Volumes are in preparation.*

BADMINTON MAGAZINE (THE) OF SPORTS AND PASTIMES. Edited by ALFRED E. T. WATSON ("Rapier"). With numerous Illustrations. Price 1s. monthly.
Vols. I.-III. 6s. each.

Bickerdyke.—*DAYS OF MY LIFE ON WATERS FRESH AND SALT*; and other Papers. By JOHN BICKERDYKE. With Photo-Etched Frontispiece and 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

- DEAD SHOT (THE):** or, Sportsman's Complete Guide. Being a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Rudimentary and Finishing Lessons on the Art of Shooting Game of all kinds. Also Game-driving, Wildfowl and Pigeon-shooting, Dog-breaking, etc. By MARKSMAN. Illustrated. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
- Ellis.**—*CHESS SPARKS*; or, Short and Bright Games of Chess. Collected and Arranged by J. H. ELLIS, M.A. 8vo., 4s. 6d.
- Falkener.**—*GAMES, ANCIENT AND ORIENTAL, AND HOW TO PLAY THEM.* By EDWARD FALKENER. With numerous Photographs, Diagrams, &c. 8vo., 21s.
- Ford.**—*THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ARCHERY.* By HORACE FORD. New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Re-written by W. BUTT, M.A. With a Preface by C. J. LONGMAN, M.A. 8vo., 14s.
- Francis.**—*A BOOK ON ANGLING:* or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every Branch; including full Illustrated List of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. With Portrait and Coloured Plates. Crown 8vo., 15s.
- Gibson.**—*TOBOGGANING ON CROOKED RUNS.* By the Hon. HARRY GIBSON. With Contributions by F. DE B. STRICKLAND and 'LADY-TOBOGANNER'. With 40 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Graham.**—*COUNTRY PASTIMES FOR BOYS.* By P. ANDERSON GRAHAM. With 252 Illustrations from Drawings and Photographs. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- Lang.**—*ANGLING SKETCHES.* By ANDREW LANG. With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Longman.**—*CHESS OPENINGS.* By FREDERICK W. LONGMAN. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Maskelyne.**—*SHARPS AND FLATS:* a Complete Revelation of the Secrets of Cheating at Games of Chance and Skill. By JOHN NEVIL MASKELYNE, of the Egyptian Hall. With 62 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Park.**—*THE GAME OF GOLF.* By WILLIAM PARK, Jun., Champion Golfer, 1887-89. With 17 Plates and 26 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Payne-Gallwey (SIR RALPH, Bart.).**
LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS (First Series). On the Choice and use of a Gun. With 41 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS (Second Series). On the Production, Preservation, and Killing of Game. With Directions in Shooting Wood-Pigeons and Breaking-in Retrievers. With Portrait and 103 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.
LETTERS TO YOUNG SHOOTERS. (Third Series.) Comprising a Short Natural History of the Wildfowl that are Rare or Common to the British Islands, with complete directions in Shooting Wildfowl on the Coast and Inland. With 200 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 18s.
- Pole (WILLIAM).**
THE THEORY OF THE MODERN SCIENTIFIC GAME OF WHIST. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
THE EVOLUTION OF WHIST: a Study of the Progressive Changes which the Game has undergone. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
- Proctor.**—*HOW TO PLAY WHIST: WITH THE LAWS AND ETIQUETTE OF WHIST.* By RICHARD A. PROCTOR. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Ronalds.**—*THE FLY-FISHER'S ENTOMOLOGY.* By ALFRED RONALDS. With 20 coloured Plates. 8vo., 14s.
- Thompson and Cannan.** *HAND-IN-HAND FIGURE SKATING.* By NORCLIFFE G. THOMPSON and F. LAURA CANNAN, Members of the Skating Club. With an Introduction by Captain J. H. THOMSON, R.A. With Illustrations. 16mo., 6s.
- Wilcocks.**—*THE SEA FISHERMAN:* Comprising the Chief Methods of Hook and Line Fishing in the British and other Seas, and Remarks on Nets, Boats, and Boating. By J. C. WILCOCKS. Illustrated. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy.

LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &C.

Abbott.—*THE ELEMENTS OF LOGIC.*
By T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. 12mo., 3s.

Aristotle.

THE POLITICS: G. Bekker's Greek Text of Books I., III., IV. (VII.), with an English Translation by W. E. BOLLAND, M.A.; and short Introductory Essays by A. LANG, M.A. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

THE POLITICS: Introductory Essays. By ANDREW LANG (from Bolland and Lang's 'Politics'). Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE ETHICS: Greek Text, Illustrated with Essay and Notes. By Sir ALEXANDER GRANT, Bart. 2 vols. 8vo., 32s.

AN INTRODUCTION TO ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS. Books I.-IV. (Book X. c. vi.-ix. in an Appendix). With a continuous Analysis and Notes. By the Rev. EDWARD MOORE, D.D., Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Bacon (FRANCIS).

COMPLETE WORKS. Edited by R. L. ELLIS, JAMES SPEDDING and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo., £3 13s. 6d.

LETTERS AND LIFE, including all his occasional Works. Edited by JAMES SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4s.

THE ESSAYS: with Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

THE ESSAYS. Edited, with Notes, by F. STORR and C. H. GIBSON. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

THE ESSAYS: with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 2 Vols. Fcp. 8vo., 6s. The Text and Index only, without Introduction and Notes, in One Volume. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Bain (ALEXANDER).

MENTAL SCIENCE. Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d.

MORAL SCIENCE. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

The two works as above can be had in one volume, price 10s. 6d.

SENSES AND THE INTELLECT. 8vo., 15s.

EMOTIONS AND THE WILL. 8vo., 15s.

Bain (ALEXANDER)—*continued.*

LOGIC, DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE.

Part I. 4s. Part II. 6s. 6d.

PRACTICAL ESSAYS. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

Bray (CHARLES).

THE PHILOSOPHY OF NECESSITY: or, Law in Mind as in Matter. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

THE EDUCATION OF THE FEELINGS: a Moral System for Schools. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Bray.—*ELEMENTS OF MORALITY*, in Easy Lessons for Home and School Teaching. By Mrs. CHARLES BRAY. Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d.

Davidson.—*THE LOGIC OF DEFINITION*, Explained and Applied. By WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Green (THOMAS HILL).—*THE WORKS OF.* Edited by R. L. NETTLESHIP. Vols. I. and II. Philosophical Works. 8vo., 16s. each.

Vol. III. Miscellanies. With Index to the three Volumes, and Memoir. 8vo., 21s.

LECTURES ON THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION. With Preface by BERNARD BOSANQUET. 8vo., 5s.

Hodgson (SHADWORTH H.).

TIME AND SPACE: A Metaphysical Essay. 8vo., 16s.

THE THEORY OF PRACTICE: an Ethical Inquiry. 2 vols. 8vo., 24s.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF REFLECTION. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

Hume.—*THE PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS OF DAVID HUME.* Edited by T. H. GREEN and T. H. GROSE. 4 vols. 8vo., 56s. Or separately, Essays. 2 vols. 28s. Treatise of Human Nature. 2 vols. 28s.

Justinian.—*THE INSTITUTES OF JUSTINIAN*: Latin Text, chiefly that of Huschke, with English Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Summary. By THOMAS C. SANDARS, M.A. 8vo., 18s.

Kant (IMMANUEL).

CRITIQUE OF PRACTICAL REASON, AND OTHER WORKS ON THE THEORY OF ETHICS. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. With Memoir. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Mental, Moral and Political Philosophy—*continued.***Kant (IMMANUEL)**—*continued.*

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT, B.D. (Extracted from 'Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and other Works on the Theory of Ethics.') Crown 8vo., 3s.

INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC, AND HIS ESSAY ON THE MISTAKEN SUBTILTY OF THE FOUR FIGURES. Translated by T. K. ABBOTT. 8vo., 6s.

Killick.—*HANDBOOK TO MILL'S SYSTEM OF LOGIC.* By Rev. A. H. KILLICK, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Ladd (GEORGE TRUMBULL).

PHILOSOPHY OF MIND : An Essay on the Metaphysics of Psychology. 8vo., 16s.

ELEMENTS OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY. 8vo., 21s.

OUTLINES OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY. A Text-book of Mental Science for Academies and Colleges. 8vo., 12s.

PSYCHOLOGY, DESCRIPTIVE AND EXPLANATORY : a Treatise of the Phenomena, Laws, and Development of Human Mental Life. 8vo., 21s.

PRIMER OF PSYCHOLOGY. Cr. 8vo., 5s. 6d.

Lewes.—*THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY,* from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. 2 vols. 8vo., 32s.

Max Müller (F.).

THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. 8vo., 21s.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Mill.—*ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF THE HUMAN MIND.* By JAMES MILL. 2 vols. 8vo., 28s.

Mill (JOHN STUART).

A SYSTEM OF LOGIC. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

ON LIBERTY. Crown 8vo., 1s. 4d.

ON REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT. Crown 8vo., 2s.

UTILITARIANISM. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

EXAMINATION OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON'S PHILOSOPHY. 8vo., 16s.

NATURE, THE UTILITY OF RELIGION, AND THEISM. Three Essays. 8vo., 5s.

Mosso.—*FEAR.* By ANGELO MOSSO.

Translated from the Italian by E. LOUGH and F. KIESOW. With 8 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Romanes.—*MIND AND MOTION AND MONISM.* By GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, LL.D., F.R.S. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Stock.—*DEDUCTIVE LOGIC.* By ST. GEORGE STOCK. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Sully (JAMES).

THE HUMAN MIND : a Text-book of Psychology. 2 vols. 8vo., 21s.

OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY. 8vo., 9s.

THE TEACHER'S HANDBOOK OF PSYCHOLOGY. Crown 8vo., 5s.

STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Swinburne.—*PICTURE LOGIC :* an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning. By ALFRED JAMES SWINBURNE, M.A. With 23 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Weber.—*HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.* By ALFRED WEBER. Professor in the University of Strasburg. Translated by FRANK THILLY, Ph.D. 8vo., 16s.

Whately (ARCHBISHOP).

BACON'S ESSAYS. With Annotations. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF LOGIC. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC. Cr. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

LESSONS ON REASONING. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

Zeller (Dr. EDWARD, Professor in the University of Berlin).

THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, AND SCEPTICS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 15s.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and EVELYN ABBOTT. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

PLATO AND THE OLDER ACADEMY. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE and ALFRED GOODWIN, B.A. Crown 8vo. 18s.

SOCRATES AND THE SOCRATIC SCHOOLS. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy—*continued.*

MANUALS OF CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY.

(Stonyhurst Series).

A MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By C. S. DEVAS, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.*FIRST PRINCIPLES OF KNOWLEDGE.* By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.*GENERAL METAPHYSICS.* By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.*LOGIC.* By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.*MORAL PHILOSOPHY (ETHICS AND NATURAL LAW).* By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5s.*NATURAL THEOLOGY.* By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.*PSYCHOLOGY.* By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.

History and Science of Language, &c.

Davidson.—*LEADING AND IMPORTANT ENGLISH WORDS:* Explained and Exemplified. By WILLIAM L. DAVIDSON, M.A. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*Farrar.*—*LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES:* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S. Crown 8vo., 6s.*Graham.*—*ENGLISH SYNONYMS,* Classified and Explained: with Practical Exercises. By G. F. GRAHAM. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.*Max Müller (F.).**THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.*—Founded on Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution in 1861 and 1863. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 21s.*Max Müller (F.)—continued.**BIOGRAPHIES OF WORDS, AND THE HOME OF THE ARYAS.* Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.*THREE LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE, AND ITS PLACE IN GENERAL EDUCATION;* delivered at Oxford, 1889. Crown 8vo., 3s.*Roget.*—*THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES.* Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By PETER MARK ROGET, M.D., F.R.S. Recomposed throughout, enlarged and improved, partly from the Author's Notes, and with a full Index, by the Author's Son, JOHN LEWIS ROGET. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.*Whately.*—*ENGLISH SYNONYMS.* By E. JANE WHATELY. Fcp. 8vo., 3s.

Political Economy and Economics.

Ashley.—*ENGLISH ECONOMIC HISTORY AND THEORY.* By W. J. ASHLEY, M.A. Crown 8vo., Part I., 5s. Part II. 10s. 6d.*Bagehot.*—*ECONOMIC STUDIES.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*Barnett.*—*PRACTICABLE SOCIALISM.* Essays on Social Reform. By the Rev. S. A. and Mrs. BARNETT. Crown 8vo., 6s.*Brassey.*—*PAPERS AND ADDRESSES ON WORK AND WAGES.* By Lord BRASSEY. Edited by J. POTTER, and with Introduction by GEORGE HOWELL, M.P. Crown 8vo., 5s.*Devas.*—*A MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.* By C. S. DEVAS, M.A. Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d. (*Manuals of Catholic Philosophy.*)*Dowell.*—*A HISTORY OF TAXATION AND TAXES IN ENGLAND,* from the Earliest Times to the Year 1885. By STEPHEN DOWELL, (4 vols. 8vo.) Vols. I. and II. The History of Taxation, 21s. Vols. III. and IV. The History of Taxes, 21s.*Jordan.*—*THE STANDARD OF VALUE.* By WILLIAM LEIGHTON JORDAN, Fellow of the Royal Statistical Society, &c. Crown 8vo., 6s.*Macleod (HENRY DUNNING).**BIMETALISM.* 8vo., 5s. net.*THE ELEMENTS OF BANKING.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF BANKING.* Vol. I. 8vo., 12s. Vol. II. 14s.*THE THEORY OF CREDIT.* 8vo. Vol. I., 10s. net. Vol. II., Part I., 10s. net. Vol. II., Part II., 10s. 6d.*A DIGEST OF THE LAW OF BILLS OF EXCHANGE, BANK-NOTES, &c.**[In the press.]**Mill.*—*POLITICAL ECONOMY.* By JOHN STUART MILL.*Popular Edition.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*Library Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo., 30s.

Political Economy and Economics—*continued.*

Mulhall.—*INDUSTRIES AND WEALTH OF NATIONS.* By MICHAEL G. MULHALL, F.S.S. With 32 full-page Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Soderini.—*SOCIALISM AND CATHOLICISM.* From the Italian of Count EDWARD SODERINI. By RICHARD JENERY-SHEE. With a Preface by Cardinal VAUGHAN. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Symes.—*POLITICAL ECONOMY:* a Short Text-book of Political Economy. With Problems for Solution, and Hints for Supplementary Reading; also a Supplementary Chapter on Socialism. By PROFESSOR J. E. SYMES, M.A., of University College, Nottingham. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Toynbee.—*LECTURES ON THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION OF THE 18TH CENTURY IN ENGLAND:* Popular Addresses, Notes and other Fragments. By ARNOLD TOYNBEE. With a Memoir of the Author by BENJAMIN JOWETT, D.D. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Vincent.—*THE LAND QUESTION IN NORTH WALES:* being a Brief Survey of the History, Origin, and Character of the Agrarian Agitation, and of the Nature and Effect of the Proceedings of the Welsh Land Commission. By J. E. VINCENT. 8vo., 5s.

Webb.—*THE HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM.* By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. With Map and full Bibliography of the Subject. 8vo., 18s.

STUDIES IN ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE.

Issued under the auspices of the London School of Economics and Political Science.

THE HISTORY OF LOCAL RATES IN ENGLAND: Five Lectures. By EDWIN CANNAN, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, B.A. With an Appendix on Social Democracy and the Woman Question in Germany by ALYS RUSSELL, B.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

SELECT DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATING THE HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM.

I. The Tailoring Trade. Edited by W. F. GALTON. With a Preface by SIDNEY WEBB, LL.B. Crown 8vo., 5s.

DEPLOIGES REFERENDUM EN SUISSE. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by C. P. TREVELYAN, M.A. [*In preparation.*]

SELECT DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATING THE STATE REGULATION OF WAGES. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. A. S. HEWINS, M.A. [*In preparation.*]

HUNGARIAN GILD RECORDS. Edited by Dr. JULIUS MANDELLO, of Budapest. [*In preparation.*]

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ENGLAND AND THE HANSEATIC LEAGUE. By Miss E. A. MACARTHUR. [*In preparation.*]

Evolution, Anthropology, &c.

Babington.—*FALLACIES OF RACE THEORIES AS APPLIED TO NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.* Essays by WILLIAM DALTON BABINGTON, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Clodd (EDWARD).

THE STORY OF CREATION: a Plain Account of Evolution. With 77 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

A PRIMER OF EVOLUTION: being a Popular Abridged Edition of 'The Story of Creation'. With Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

Lang.—*CUSTOM AND MYTH:* Studies of Early Usage and Belief. By ANDREW LANG. With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Lubbock.—*THE ORIGIN OF CIVILISATION,* and the Primitive Condition of Man. By Sir J. LUBBOCK, Bart., M.P. With 5 Plates and 20 Illustrations in the Text. 8vo., 18s.

Romanes (GEORGE JOHN).

DARWIN, AND AFTER DARWIN: an Exposition of the Darwinian Theory, and a Discussion on Post-Darwinian Questions. Part I. *THE DARWINIAN THEORY.* With Portrait of Darwin and 125 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Part II. *POST-DARWINIAN QUESTIONS:* Heredity and Utility. With Portrait of the Author and 5 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

AN EXAMINATION OF WEISMANNISM. Crown 8vo., 6s.

ESSAYS.—Edited by C. LLOYD MORGAN, Principal of University College, Bristol.

Classical Literature, Translations, &c.

- Abbott.**—*HELLENICA*. A Collection of Essays on Greek Poetry, Philosophy, History, and Religion. Edited by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 16s.
- Æschylus.**—*EUMENIDES OF ÆSCHYLUS*. With Metrical English Translation. By J. F. DAVIES. 8vo., 7s.
- Aristophanes.**—*THE ACHARNIANS OF ARISTOPHANES*, translated into English Verse. By R. Y. TYRRELL. Crown 8vo., 1s.
- Aristotle.**—*YOUTH AND OLD AGE, LIFE AND DEATH, AND RESPIRATION*. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by W. OGLE, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
- Becker** (PROFESSOR).
GALLUS: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. Illustrated. Post 8vo., 3s. 6d.
CHARICLES: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. Illustrated. Post 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Cicero.**—*CICERO'S CORRESPONDENCE*. By R. Y. TYRRELL. Vols. I., II., III., 8vo., each 12s. Vol. IV., 15s.
- Egbert.**—*INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF LATIN INSCRIPTIONS*. By JAMES C. EGBERT, Junr., Ph.D. With numerous Illustrations and Facsimiles. Square crown 8vo., 16s.
- Farnell.**—*GREEK LYRIC POETRY*: a Complete Collection of the Surviving Passages from the Greek Song-Writing. Arranged with Prefatory Articles, Introductory Matter and Commentary. By GEORGE S. FARNELL, M.A. With 5 Plates. 8vo., 16s.
- Lang.**—*HOMER AND THE EPIC*. By ANDREW LANG. Crown 8vo., 9s. net.
- Lucan.**—*THE PHARSALIA OF LUCAN*. Translated into Blank Verse. By EDWARD RIDLEY, Q.C. 8vo., 14s.
- Mackail.**—*SELECT EPIGRAMS FROM THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY*. By J. W. MACKAIL. Edited with a Revised Text, Introduction, Translation, and Notes. 8vo., 16s.
- Rich.**—*A DICTIONARY OF ROMAN AND GREEK ANTIQUITIES*. By A. RICH, B.A. With 2000 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Sophocles.**—Translated into English Verse. By ROBERT WHITELAW, M.A., Assistant Master in Rugby School. Cr. 8vo., 8s. 6d.
- Tacitus.**—*THE HISTORY OF P. CORNELIUS TACITUS*. Translated into English, with an Introduction and Notes, Critical and Explanatory, by ALBERT WILLIAM QUILL, M.A., T.C.D. 2 vols. Vol. I. 8vo., 7s. 6d. Vol. II. 8vo., 12s. 6d.
- Tyrrell.**—*TRANSLATIONS INTO GREEK AND LATIN VERSE*. Edited by R. Y. TYRRELL. 8vo., 6s.
- Virgil.**
THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse by JOHN CONINGTON. Crown 8vo., 6s.
THE POEMS OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Prose by JOHN CONINGTON. Crown 8vo., 6s.
THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL, freely translated into English Blank Verse. By W. J. THORNHILL. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.
THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL. Translated into English Verse by JAMES RHODES. Books I.-VI. Crown 8vo., 5s. Books VII.-XII. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Poetry and the Drama.

- Acworth.**—*BALLADS OF THE MARATHAS*. Rendered into English Verse from the Marathi Originals. By HARRY ARBUTHNOT ACWORTH. 8vo., 5s.
- Allingham** (WILLIAM).
IRISH SONGS AND POEMS. With Frontispiece of the Waterfall of Asaroe. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.
LAURENCE BLOOMFIELD. With Portrait of the Author. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
FLOWER PIECES; DAY AND NIGHT SONGS; BALLADS. With 2 Designs by D. G. ROSSETTI. Fcp. 8vo., 6s. large paper edition, 12s.
- Allingham** (WILLIAM)—continued.
LIFE AND PHANTASY: with Frontispiece by Sir J. E. MILLAIS, Bart., and Design by ARTHUR HUGHES. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.; large paper edition, 12s.
THOUGHT AND WORD, AND ASHEY MANOR: a Play. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.; large paper edition, 12s.
BLACKBERRIES. Imperial 16mo., 6s.
Sets of the above 6 vols. may be had in uniform Half-parchment binding, price 30s.

Poetry and the Drama—*continued*.**Armstrong (G. F. SAVAGE).**

POEMS : Lyrical and Dramatic. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

KING SAUL. (The Tragedy of Israel, Part I.) Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

KING DAVID. (The Tragedy of Israel, Part II.) Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

KING SOLOMON. (The Tragedy of Israel, Part III.) Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

UGONE : a Tragedy. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

A GARLAND FROM GREECE : Poems. Fcp. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

STORIES OF WICKLOW : Poems. Fcp. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

MEPHISTOPHELES IN BROADCLOTH : a Satire. Fcp. 8vo., 4s.

ONE IN THE INFINITE : a Poem. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Armstrong.—*THE POETICAL WORKS OF EDMUND F. ARMSTRONG*. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

Arnold (Sir EDWIN).

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD : or the Great Consummation. With 14 Illustrations after HOLMAN HUNT. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

POTIPHAR'S WIFE, and other Poems. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

ADZUMA : or the Japanese Wife. A Play. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

THE TENTH MUSE, and other Poems. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

Beesly (A. H.).

BALLADS AND OTHER VERSE. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

DANTON, AND OTHER VERSE. Fcp. 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Bell (MRS. HUGH).

CHAMBER COMEDIES : a Collection of Plays and Monologues for the Drawing Room. Crown 8vo., 6s.

FAIRY TALE PLAYS, AND HOW TO ACT THEM. With 91 Diagrams and 52 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Carmichael.—*POEMS*. By JENNINGS CARMICHAEL (MRS. FRANCIS MULLIS). Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

Christie.—*LAYS AND VERSES*. By NIMMO CHRISTIE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Cochrane (ALFRED).

THE KESTREL'S NEST, and other Verses. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

LEVIORE PLECTRO : Occasional Verses. Fcp. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Florian's Fables.—*THE FABLES OF FLORIAN*. Done into English Verse by Sir PHILIP PERRING, Bart. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Goethe.

FAUST, Part I., the German Text, with Introduction and Notes. By ALBERT M. SELSS, Ph.D., M.A. Crown 8vo., 5s.

FAUST. Translated, with Notes. By T. E. WEBB. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Gurney.—*DAY-DREAMS* : Poems. By Rev. ALFRED GURNEY, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Ingelow (JEAN).

POETICAL WORKS. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 12s.

LYRICAL AND OTHER POEMS. Selected from the Writings of JEAN INGELow. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. cloth plain, 3s. cloth gilt.

Lang (ANDREW).

BAN AND ARRIÈRE BAN : a Rally of Fugitive Rhymes. Fcp. 8vo., 5s. net.

GRASS OF PARNASSUS. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

BALLADS OF BOOKS. Edited by ANDREW LANG. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

THE BLUE POETRY BOOK. Edited by ANDREW LANG. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Lecky.—*POEMS*. By W. E. H. LECKY. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

Lindsay.—*THE FLOWER SELLER*, and other Poems. By LADY LINDSAY. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Lytton (THE EARL OF), (OWEN MEREDITH).

MARAH. Fcp. 8vo., 6s. 6d.

KING POPPY : a Fantasia. With 1 Plate and Design on Title-Page by ED. BURNE-JONES, A.R.A. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

THE WANDERER. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

LUCILE. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

SELECTED POEMS. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Poetry and the Drama—*continued.*

Macaulay.—*LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, &c.* By Lord MACAULAY.

Illustrated by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to., 10s. 6d.
Bijou Edition.

18mo., 2s. 6d. gilt top.

Popular Edition.

Fcp. 4to., 6d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

Illustrated by J. R. WEGUELIN. Crown
8vo., 3s. 6d.

Annotated Edition. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. sewed,
1s. 6d. cloth.

Macdonald (GEORGE, LL.D.).

*A BOOK OF STRIFE, IN THE FORM OF
THE DIARY OF AN OLD SOUL:* Poems.
18mo., 6s.

*RAMPOLLO; GROWTHS FROM AN OLD
ROOT;* containing a Book of Translations,
old and new; also a Year's Diary of an
Old Soul. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Morris (WILLIAM).

POETICAL WORKS—LIBRARY EDITION.

Complete in Ten Volumes. Crown 8vo.,
price 6s. each.

THE EARTHLY PARADISE. 4 vols.
6s. each.

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JASON.
6s.

THE DEFENCE OF GUENEVERE, and
other Poems. 6s.

*THE STORY OF SIGURD THE VOLSUNG,
AND THE FALL OF THE NIBLUNGS.* 6s.

LOVE IS ENOUGH; or, the Freeing of
Pharamond: A Morality; and *POEMS
BY THE WAY.* 6s.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER. Done
into English Verse. 6s.

THE ÆNEIDS OF VIRGIL. Done
into English Verse. 6s.

Certain of the POETICAL WORKS may also
be had in the following Editions:—

THE EARTHLY PARADISE.

Popular Edition. 5 vols. 12mo., 25s.;
or 5s. each, sold separately.

The same in Ten Parts, 25s.; or 2s. 6d.
each, sold separately.

Cheap Edition, in 1 vol. Crown 8vo.,
7s. 6d.

LOVE IS ENOUGH; or, the Freeing of
Pharamond: A Morality. Square crown
8vo., 7s. 6d.

POEMS BY THE WAY. Square crown
8vo., 6s.

* * For Mr. William Morris's Prose
Works, see pp. 22 and 31.

Murray (ROBERT F.).—Author of
'The Scarlet Gown'. His Poems, with
a Memoir by ANDREW LANG. Fcp. 8vo.,
5s. net.

Nesbit.—*LAYS AND LEGENDS.* By E.
NESBIT (Mrs. HUBERT BLAND). First
Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. Second Series.
With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Peek (HEDLEY) (FRANK LEYTON).

SKELETON LEAVES: Poems. With
a Dedictory Poem to the late Hon.
Roden Noel. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

THE SHADOWS OF THE LAKE, and
other Poems. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

Piatt (SARAH).

*AN ENCHANTED CASTLE, AND
OTHER POEMS:* Pictures, Portraits, and
People in Ireland. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

POEMS: With Portrait of the
Author. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10s.

Piatt (JOHN JAMES).

*IDYLS AND LYRICS OF THE OHIO
VALLEY.* Crown 8vo., 5s.

LITTLE NEW WORLD IDYLS. Cr.
8vo., 5s.

Rhoades.—*TERESA AND OTHER
POEMS.* By JAMES RHOADES. Crown
8vo., 3s. 6d.

Riley (JAMES WHITCOMB).

OLD FASHIONED ROSES: Poems.
12mo., 5s.

POEMS: Here at Home. Fcp. 8vo
6s. net.

A CHILD-WORLD: POEMS. Fcp.
8vo., 5s.

Romanes.—*A SELECTION FROM THE
POEMS OF GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A.,
LL.D., F.R.S.* With an Introduction by
T. HERBERT WARREN, President of Mag-
dalen College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Shakespeare.—*BOWDLER'S FAMILY
SHAKESPEARE.* With 36 Woodcuts. 1 vol.
8vo., 14s. Or in 6 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 21s.

THE SHAKESPEARE BIRTHDAY BOOK.
By MARY F. DUNBAR. 32mo., 1s. 6d.

Sturgis.—*A BOOK OF SONG.* By
JULIAN STURGIS. 16mo. 5s.

Works of Fiction, Humour, &c.

- Alden.**—*AMONG THE FREAKS.* By W. L. ALDEN. With 55 Illustrations by J. F. SULLIVAN and FLORENCE K. UPTON. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Anstey** (F., Author of 'Vice Versâ').
- VOCES POPULI.* Reprinted from 'Punch'. First Series. With 20 Illustrations by J. BERNARD PARTRIDGE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- THE MAN FROM BLANKLEY'S:* a Story in Scenes, and other Sketches. With 24 Illustrations by J. BERNARD PARTRIDGE. Post 4to., 6s.
- Astor.**—*A JOURNEY IN OTHER WORLDS:* a Romance of the Future. By JOHN JACOB ASTOR. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- Baker.**—*BY THE WESTERN SEA.* By JAMES BAKER, Author of 'John Westacott'. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Beaconsfield** (THE EARL OF).
- NOVELS AND TALES.* Complete in 11 vols. Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d. each.
- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Vivian Grey. | Sybil. |
| The Young Duke, &c. | Henrietta Temple. |
| Alroy, Ixion, &c. | Venetia. |
| Contarini Fleming, &c. | Coningsby. |
| Tancred. | Lothair. |
| | Endymion. |
- NOVELS AND TALES.* The Hugueniden Edition. With 2 Portraits and 11 Vignettes. 11 vols. Crown 8vo., 42s.
- Black.**—*THE PRINCESS DÉSIÉE.* By CLEMENTINA BLACK. With 8 Illustrations by JOHN WILLIAMSON. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- Dougall** (L.).
- BEGGARS ALL.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- WHAT NECESSITY KNOWS.* Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Doyle** (A. CONAN).
- MICAH CLARKE:* A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- THE CAPTAIN OF THE POLESTAR,* and other Tales. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- THE REFUGEES:* A Tale of Two Continents. With 25 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- THE STARK MUNRO LETTERS.* Cr. 8vo., 6s.
- Farrar** (F. W., DEAN OF CANTERBURY).
- DARKNESS AND DAWN:* or, Scenes in the Days of Nero. An Historic Tale. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- GATHERING CLOUDS:* a Tale of the Days of St. Chrysostom. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
- Fowler.**—*THE YOUNG PRETENDERS.* A Story of Child Life. By EDITH H. FOWLER. With 12 Illustrations by PHILIP BURNE-JONES. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Froude.**—*THE TWO CHIEFS OF DUNBOY:* an Irish Romance of the Last Century. By JAMES A. FROUDE. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- Graham.**—*THE RED SCAUR:* A Novel of Manners. By P. ANDERSON GRAHAM. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- Haggard** (H. RIDER).
- HEART OF THE WORLD.* With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- JOAN HASTE.* With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.
- THE PEOPLE OF THE MIST.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- MONTEZUMA'S DAUGHTER.* With 24 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- SHE.* With 32 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- ALLAN QUATERMAIN.* With 31 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- MAIWA'S REVENGE:* Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
- COLONEL QUARITCH, V.C.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.
- CLEOPATRA.* With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Works of Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.***Haggard (H. RIDER)**—*continued.**BEATRICE.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*ERIC BRIGHTYES.* With 51 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*NADA THE LILY.* With 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*ALLAN'S WIFE.* With 34 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE WITCH'S HEAD.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*MR. MEESON'S WILL.* With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*DAWN.* With 16 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Haggard and Lang.**—*THE WORLD'S DESIRE.* By H. RIDER HAGGARD and ANDREW LANG. With 27 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Harte.**—*IN THE CARQUINEZ WOODS* and other stories. By BRET HARTE. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Hope.**—*THE HEART OF PRINCESS OSRA.* By ANTHONY HOPE. With 9 Illustrations by JOHN WILLIAMSON. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Hornung.**—*THE UNBIDDEN GUEST.* By E. W. HORNUNG. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Lang.**—*A MONK OF FIFE*; being the Chronicle written by NORMAN LESLIE of Pitcullo, concerning Marvellous Deeds that befel in the Realm of France, 1429-31. By ANDREW LANG. With 13 Illustrations by SELWYN IMAGE. Cr. 8vo., 6s.**Lyall (EDNA).***THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SLANDER.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s., sewed.

Presentation Edition. With 20 Illustrations by LANCELOT SPEED. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A TRUTH. Fcp. 8vo., 1s., sewed; 1s. 6d., cloth.*DOREEN.* The Story of a Singer. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Magruder.**—*THE VIOLET.* By JULIA MAGRUDER. With 11 Illustrations by C. D. GIBSON. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Matthews.**—*HIS FATHER'S SON:* a Novel of the New York Stock Exchange. By BRANDER MATTHEWS. With 13 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s.**Melville (G. J. WHYTE).**

The Gladiators.

The Interpreter.

Good for Nothing.

The Queen's Maries.

Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d. each.

Holmby House.

Kate Coventry.

Digby Grand.

General Bounce.

Merriman.—*FLOTSAM:* The Study of a Life. By HENRY SETON MERRIMAN, with Frontispiece and Vignette by H. G. MASSEY, A.R.E. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Morris (WILLIAM).***THE WELL AT THE WORLD'S END.* 2 vols. 8vo., 28s.*THE STORY OF THE GLITTERING PLAIN,* which has been also called *The Land of the Living Men*, or *The Acre of the Undying.* Square post 8vo., 5s. net.*THE ROOTS OF THE MOUNTAINS,* wherein is told somewhat of the Lives of the Men of Burgdale, their Friends, their Neighbours, their Foemen, and their Fellows-in-Arms. Written in Prose and Verse. Square crown 8vo., 8s.*A TALE OF THE HOUSE OF THE WOLFINGS,* and all the Kindreds of the Mark. Written in Prose and Verse. Second Edition. Square crown 8vo., 6s.*A DREAM OF JOHN BALL, AND A KING'S LESSON.* 12mo., 1s. 6d.*NEWS FROM NOWHERE;* or, An Epoch of Rest. Being some Chapters from an Utopian Romance. Post 8vo., 1s. 6d.

* * For Mr. William Morris's Poetical Works, see p. 20.

Newman (CARDINAL).*LOSS AND GAIN:* The Story of a Convert. Crown 8vo. Cabinet Edition, 6s.; Popular Edition, 3s. 6d.*CALLISTA:* A Tale of the Third Century. Crown 8vo. Cabinet Edition, 6s.; Popular Edition, 3s. 6d.**Oliphant.**—*OLD MR. TREDGOLD.* By MRS. OLIPHANT. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Phillipps-Wolley.**—*SNAP:* a Legend of the Lone Mountain. By C. PHILLIPPS-WOLLEY. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Quintana.**—*THE CID CAMPEADOR:* an Historical Romance. By D. ANTONIO DE TRUEBA Y LA QUINTANA. Translated from the Spanish by HENRY J. GILL, M.A., T.C.D. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Works of Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.***Rhoscomyl (OWEN).**

THE JEWEL OF YNYS GALON: being a hitherto unprinted Chapter in the History of the Sea Rovers. With 12 Illustrations by LANCELOT SPEED. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

BATTEMENT AND TOWER: a Romance. With Frontispiece by R. COTAN WOODVILLE. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Rokeby.—*DORCAS HOBDAV.* By CHARLES ROKERY. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Sewell (ELIZABETH M.).**

A Glimpse of the World	Amy Herbert
Laneton Parsonage.	Cleve Hall.
Margaret Percival.	Gertrude.
Katharine Ashton.	Home Life.
The Earl's Daughter.	After Life.
The Experience of Life	Ursula. Ivors.

Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d. each cloth plain. 2s. 6d. each cloth extra, gilt edges.

Stevenson (ROBERT LOUIS).

THE STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. sewed. 1s. 6d. cloth.

THE STRANGE CASE OF DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE; WITH OTHER FABLES. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

MORE NEW ARABIAN NIGHTS—THE DYNAMITER. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON and FANNY VAN DE GRIFT STEVENSON. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE WRONG BOX. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON and LLOYD OSBOURNE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Suttner.—*LAY DOWN YOUR ARMS (Die Waffen Nieder)*: The Autobiography of Martha Tilling. By BERTHA VON SUTTNER. Translated by T. HOLMES. Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.**Trollope (ANTHONY).**

THE WARDEN. Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

BARCHESTER TOWERS. Cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

TRUE (A) RELATION OF THE TRAVELS AND PERILOUS ADVENTURES OF MATHEW DUDGEON, GENTLEMAN: Wherein is truly set down the Manner of his Taking, the Long Time of his Slavery in Algiers, and Means of his Delivery. Written by Himself, and now for the first time printed. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

Walford (L. B.).

MR. SMITH: a Part of his Life. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE BABY'S GRANDMOTHER. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

COUSINS. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

TROUBLESOME DAUGHTERS. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

PAULINE. Crown. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

DICK NETHERBY. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE HISTORY OF A WEEK. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

A STIFF-NECKED GENERATION. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

NAN, and other Stories. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE MISCHIEF OF MONICA. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE ONE GOOD GUEST. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

'PLOUGHED,' and other Stories. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

THE MATCHMAKER. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

West (B. B.).

HALF-HOURS WITH THE MILLIONAIRES: Showing how much harder it is to spend a million than to make it. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

SIR SIMON VANDERPETTER, and MINDING HIS ANCESTORS. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

A FINANCIAL ATONEMENT. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Weyman (STANLEY).

THE HOUSE OF THE WOLF. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

A GENTLEMAN OF FRANCE. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

THE RED COCKADE. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Whishaw.—*A BOYAR OF THE TERRIBLE*: a Romance of the Court of Ivan the Cruel, First Tzar of Russia. By FRED. WHISHAW. With 12 Illustrations by H. G. MASSEY, A.R.E. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Popular Science (Natural History, &c.).

Butler.—*OUR HOUSEHOLD INSECTS.* An Account of the Insect-Pests found in Dwelling-Houses. By EDWARD A. BUTLER, B.A., B.Sc. (Lond.). With 113 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Furneaux (W.).

THE OUTDOOR WORLD; or The Young Collector's Handbook. With 18 Plates 16 of which are coloured, and 549 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

BUTTERFLIES AND MOTHS (British). With 12 coloured Plates and 241 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.

LIFE IN PONDS AND STREAMS. With 8 coloured Plates and 331 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Hartwig (Dr. GEORGE).

THE SEA AND ITS LIVING WONDERS. With 12 Plates and 303 Woodcuts. 8vo., 7s. net.

THE TROPICAL WORLD. With 8 Plates and 172 Woodcuts. 8vo., 7s. net.

THE POLAR WORLD. With 3 Maps, 8 Plates and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo., 7s. net.

THE SUBTERRANEAN WORLD. With 3 Maps and 80 Woodcuts. 8vo., 7s. net.

THE AERIAL WORLD. With Map, 8 Plates and 60 Woodcuts. 8vo., 7s. net.

HEROES OF THE POLAR WORLD. 19 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

WONDERS OF THE TROPICAL FORESTS. 40 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

WORKERS UNDER THE GROUND. 29 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

MARVELS OVER OUR HEADS. 29 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

SEA MONSTERS AND SEA BIRDS. 75 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

DENIZENS OF THE DEEP. 117 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Hartwig (Dr. GEORGE)—*continued.*

VOLCANOES AND EARTHQUAKES. 30 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

WILD ANIMALS OF THE TROPICS. 66 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Hayward.—*BIRD NOTES.* By the late JANE MARY HAYWARD. Edited by EMMA HUBBARD. With Frontispiece and 15 Illustrations by G. E. LODGE. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Helmholtz.—*POPULAR LECTURES ON SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS.* By HERMANN VON HELMHOLTZ. With 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

Hudson.—*BRITISH BIRDS.* By W. H. HUDSON, C.M.Z.S. With a Chapter on Structure and Classification by FRANK E. BEDDARD, F.R.S. With 16 Plates (8 of which are Coloured), and over 100 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Proctor (Richard A.).

LIGHT SCIENCE FOR LEISURE HOURS. Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5s. each.

ROUGH WAYS MADE SMOOTH. Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

PLEASANT WAYS IN SCIENCE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

NATURE STUDIES. By R. A. PROCTOR, GRANT ALLEN, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER and E. CLODD. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

LEISURE READINGS. By R. A. PROCTOR, E. CLODD, A. WILSON, T. FOSTER and A. C. RANYARD. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

* * For Mr. Proctor's other books see Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Scientific Works.

Stanley.—*A FAMILIAR HISTORY OF BIRDS.* By E. STANLEY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Norwich. With Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Popular Science (Natural History, &c.)—*continued.*

Wood (REV. J. G.).

HOMES WITHOUT HANDS: A Description of the Habitation of Animals, classed according to the Principle of Construction. With 140 Illustrations. 8vo., 7s., net.

INSECTS AT HOME: A Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformations. With 700 Illustrations. 8vo., 7s. net.

INSECTS ABROAD: A Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformations. With 600 Illustrations. 8vo., 7s. net.

BIBLE ANIMALS: a Description of every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures. With 112 Illustrations. 8vo., 7s. net.

PETLAND REVISITED. With 33 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

OUT OF DOORS; a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History. With 11 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Wood (REV. J. G.)—*continued.*

STRANGE DWELLINGS: a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands'. With 60 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

BIRD LIFE OF THE BIBLE. 32 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

WONDERFUL NESTS. 30 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

HOMES UNDER THE GROUND. 28 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

WILD ANIMALS OF THE BIBLE. 29 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

DOMESTIC ANIMALS OF THE BIBLE. 23 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE BRANCH BUILDERS. 28 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

SOCIAL HABITATIONS AND PARASITIC NESTS. 18 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 2s.

Works of Reference.

Longmans' GAZETTEER OF THE WORLD. Edited by GEORGE G. CHISHOLM, M.A., B.Sc. Imp. 8vo., £2 2s. cloth, £2 12s. 6d. half-morocco.

Maunder (Samuel).

BIOGRAPHICAL TREASURY. With Supplement brought down to 1889. By Rev. JAMES WOOD. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

TREASURY OF NATURAL HISTORY: or, Popular Dictionary of Zoology. With 900 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

TREASURY OF GEOGRAPHY, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

THE TREASURY OF BIBLE KNOWLEDGE. By the Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. With 5 Maps, 15 Plates, and 300 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

TREASURY OF KNOWLEDGE AND LIBRARY OF REFERENCE. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

Maunder (Samuel)—*continued.*

HISTORICAL TREASURY. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

SCIENTIFIC AND LITERARY TREASURY. Fcp. 8vo., 6s.

THE TREASURY OF BOTANY. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S., and T. MOORE, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 12s.

Roget. — *THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES*. Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By PETER MARK ROGET, M.D., F.R.S. Recomposed throughout, enlarged and improved, partly from the Author's Notes, and with a full Index, by the Author's Son, JOHN LEWIS ROGET. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Willich. — *POPULAR TABLES* for giving information for ascertaining the value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, the Public Funds, &c. By CHARLES M. WILlich. Edited by H. BENICE JONES. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Children's Books.

Crake (Rev. A. D.).

EDWY THE FAIR; or, The First Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.*ALFGAR THE DANE*; or, The Second Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.*THE RIVAL HEIRS*: being the Third and Last Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.*THE HOUSE OF WALDERNE*. A Tale of the Cloister and the Forest in the Days of the Barons' Wars. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.*BRIAN FITZ-COUNT*. A Story of Wallingford Castle and Dorchester Abbey. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Lang (Andrew).—EDITED BY.

THE BLUE FAIRY BOOK. With 138 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.*THE RED FAIRY BOOK*. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE GREEN FAIRY BOOK*. With 99 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE YELLOW FAIRY BOOK*. With 104 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE BLUE POETRY BOOK*. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE BLUE POETRY BOOK*. School Edition, without Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.*THE TRUE STORY BOOK*. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE RED TRUE STORY BOOK*. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.*THE ANIMAL STORY BOOK*. With 67 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Meade (L. T.).

DADDY'S BOY. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*DEB AND THE DUCHESS*. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE BERESFORD PRIZE*. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*THE HOUSE OF SURPRISES*. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.Molesworth—*SILVERTHORNS*. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH. With Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5s.Stevenson.—*A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES*. By ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.

Upton (Florence K. and Bertha).

THE ADVENTURES OF TWO DUTCH DOLLS AND A 'GOLLIWOGG'. Illustrated by FLORENCE K. UPTON, with Words by BERTHA UPTON. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.*THE GOLLIWOGG'S BICYCLE CLUB*. Illustrated by FLORENCE K. UPTON, with words by BERTHA UPTON. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6s.Wordsworth.—*THE SNOW GARDEN, AND OTHER FAIRY TALES FOR CHILDREN*. By ELIZABETH WORDSWORTH. With 10 Illustrations by TREVOR HADDON. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Longmans' Series of Books for Girls.

Price 2s. 6d. each.

ATELIER (THE) DU LYS: or, an Art Student in the Reign of Terror.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

MADMOISELLE MORI: a Tale of Modern Rome. *THAT CHILD UNDER A CLOUD*.*IN THE OLDEN TIME*: a Tale of the Peasant War in Germany. *HESTER'S VENTURE THE FIDDLER OF LUGAU*.*THE YOUNGER SISTER*. *A CHILD OF THE REVOLUTION*.*ATHERSTONE PRIORY*. By L. N. COMYN.*THE STORY OF A SPRING MORNING*, etc. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH. Illustrated.*THE PALACE IN THE GARDEN*. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH. Illustrated.*NEIGHBOURS*. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH. *THE THIRD MISS ST. QUENTIN*. By Mrs. MOLESWORTH.*VERY YOUNG; AND QUITE ANOTHER STORY*. Two Stories. By JEAN INGELOW.*CAN THIS BE LOVE?* By LOUISA PARR.*KEITH DERAMORE*. By the Author of 'Miss Molly'.*SIDNEY*. By MARGARET DELAND.*AN ARRANGED MARRIAGE*. By DOROTHEA GERARD.*LAST WORDS TO GIRLS ON LIFE AT SCHOOL AND AFTER SCHOOL*. By MARIA GREY.*STRAY THOUGHTS FOR GIRLS*. By LUCY H. M. SOULSBY, Head Mistress of Oxford High School. 16mo., 1s. 6d. net.

The Silver Library.

CROWN 8VO. 3s. 6d. EACH VOLUME.

- Arnold's (Sir Edwin) Seas and Lands.** With 71 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Bagehot's (W.) Biographical Studies.** 3s. 6d.
- Bagehot's (W.) Economic Studies.** 3s. 6d.
- Bagehot's (W.) Literary Studies.** With Portrait. 3 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Baker's (Sir S. W.) Eight Years in Ceylon.** With 6 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Baker's (Sir S. W.) Rifle and Hound in Ceylon.** With 6 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Curious Myths of the Middle Ages.** 3s. 6d.
- Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Origin and Development of Religious Belief.** 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Becker's (Prof.) Gallus: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus.** Illustrated. 3s. 6d.
- Becker's (Prof.) Charicles: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks.** Illustrated. 3s. 6d.
- Bent's (J. T.) The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland.** With 117 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Brassey's (Lady) A Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'.** With 66 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Butler's (Edward A.) Our Household Insects.** With 7 Plates and 113 Illustrations in the Text. 3s. 6d.
- Clodd's (E.) Story of Creation: a Plain Account of Evolution.** With 77 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Conybeare (Rev. W. J.) and Howson's (Very Rev. J. S.) Life and Epistles of St. Paul.** 46 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Dougall's (L.) Beggars All: a Novel.** 3s. 6d.
- Doyle's (A. Conan) Micah Clarke.** A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. 10 Illusts. 3s. 6d.
- Doyle's (A. Conan) The Captain of the Polestar,** and other Tales. 3s. 6d.
- Doyle's (A. Conan) The Refugees: A Tale of Two Continents.** With 25 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Froude's (J. A.) Short Studies on Great Subjects.** 4 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Froude's (J. A.) Thomas Carlyle: a History of his Life.** 1795-1835. 2 vols. 7s. 1834-1881. 2 vols. 7s.
- Froude's (J. A.) Cæsar: a Sketch.** 3s. 6d.
- Froude's (J. A.) The Spanish Story of the Armada,** and other Essays. 3s. 6d.
- Froude's (J. A.) The Two Chiefs of Dunboy: an Irish Romance of the Last Century.** 3s. 6d.
- Froude's (J. A.) The History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada.** 12 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Froude's (J. A.) The English in Ireland.** 3 vols. 10s. 6d.
- Gleig's (Rev. G. R.) Life of the Duke of Wellington.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.
- Greville's (C. C. F.) Journal of the Reigns of King George IV., King William IV., and Queen Victoria.** 8 vols., 3s. 6d. each.
- Haggard's (H. R.) She: A History of Adventure.** 32 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Allan Quatermain.** With 20 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Colonel Quaritch, V.C.: a Tale of Country Life.** 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Cleopatra.** With 29 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Eric Brighteyes.** With 51 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Beatrice.** 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Allan's Wife.** With 34 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Montezuma's Daughter.** With 25 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) The Witch's Head.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Mr. Meeson's Will.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Nada the Lily.** With 23 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) Dawn.** With 16 Illusts. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard's (H. R.) The People of the Mist.** With 16 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Haggard (H. R.) and Lang's (A.) The World's Desire.** With 27 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Harte's (Bret) In the Carquinez Woods and other Stories.** 3s. 6d.
- Helmholtz's (Hermann von) Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects.** With 68 Illustrations. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
- Hornung's (E. W.) The Unbidden Guest.** 3s. 6d.
- Howitt's (W.) Visits to Remarkable Places** 80 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) The Story of My Heart: My Autobiography.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Field and Hedgerow.** With Portrait. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Red Deer.** 17 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) Wood Magic: a Fable.** With Frontispiece and Vignette by E. V. B. 3s. 6d.
- Jefferies' (R.) The Tollers of the Field.** With Portrait from the Bust in Salisbury Cathedral. 3s. 6d.
- Knight's (E. F.) The Cruise of the 'Alerie': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad.** With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Knight's (E. F.) Where Three Empires Meet: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Baltistan, Gilgit.** With a Map and 54 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Knight's (E. F.) The 'Falcon' on the Baltic: a Coasting Voyage from Hammersmith to Copenhagen in a Three-Ton Yacht.** With Map and 11 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Angling Sketches.** 20 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (A.) Custom and Myth: Studies of Early Usage and Belief.** 3s. 6d.
- Lang's (Andrew) Cock Lane and Common-Sense.** With a New Preface. 3s. 6d.

The Silver Library—*continued.*

- Lees (J. A.) and Clutterbuck's (W. J.) B. C. 1887, A Ramble in British Columbia. With Maps and 75 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Macaulay's (Lord) Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome. With Portrait and Illustration. 3s. 6d.
 Macleod's (H. D.) Elements of Banking. 3s. 6d.
 Marshman's (J. C.) Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock. 3s. 6d.
 Max Müller's (F.) India, what can it teach us? 3s. 6d.
 Max Müller's (F.) Introduction to the Science of Religion. 3s. 6d.
 Merivale's (Dean) History of the Romans under the Empire. 8 vols. 3s. 6d. each.
 Mill's (J. S.) Political Economy. 3s. 6d.
 Mill's (J. S.) System of Logic. 3s. 6d.
 Milner's (Geo.) Country Pleasures: the Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a Garden. 3s. 6d.
 Nansen's (F.) The First Crossing of Greenland. With Illustrations and a Map. 3s. 6d.
 Philipps-Wolley's (G.) Snap: a Legend of the Lone Mountain. 13 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) The Orbs Around Us. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) The Expanse of Heaven. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Other Worlds than Ours. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Other Suns than Ours. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Rough Ways made Smooth. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Pleasant Ways in Science. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Myths and Marvels of Astronomy. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Nature Studies. 3s. 6d.
 Proctor's (R. A.) Leisure Readings. By R. A. PROCTOR, EDWARD CLODD, ANDREW WILSON, THOMAS FOSTER, and A. C. RANYARD. With Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Rhoscomyl's (Owen) The Jewel of Ynys Galon. With 12 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Rossetti's (Maria F.) A Shadow of Dante. 3s. 6d.
 Smith's (R. Bosworth) Carthage and the Carthaginians. With Maps, Plans, &c. 3s. 6d.
 Stanley's (Bishop) Familiar History of Birds. 160 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Stevenson's (R. L.) The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; with other Fables. 3s. 6d.
 Stevenson (R. L.) and Osbourne's (Ll.) The Wrong Box. 3s. 6d.
 Stevenson (Robert Louis) and Stevenson's (Fanny van de Grift) More New Arabian Nights.—The Dynamiter. 3s. 6d.
 Weyman's (Stanley J.) The House of the Wolf: a Romance. 3s. 6d.
 Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Petland Revisited. With 33 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Strange Dwellings. With 60 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.
 Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Out of Doors. With 11 Illustrations. 3s. 6d.

Cookery, Domestic Management, Gardening, &c.

- Acton. — *MODERN COOKERY.* By ELIZA ACTON. With 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 4s. 6d.
 Bull (THOMAS, M.D.).
HINTS TO MOTHERS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF THEIR HEALTH DURING THE PERIOD OF PREGNANCY. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
THE MATERNAL MANAGEMENT OF CHILDREN IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
 De Salis (MRS.).
CAKES AND CONFECTIONS À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
DOGS: A Manual for Amateurs. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
DRESSED GAME AND POULTRY À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
 De Salis (MRS.).—*continued.*
DRESSED VEGETABLES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
DRINKS À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
ENTRÉES À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
FLORAL DECORATIONS. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
GARDENING À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo. Part I., Vegetables, 1s. 6d. Part II., Fruits, 1s. 6d.
NATIONAL VIANDS À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
NEW-LAID EGGS. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.
OYSTERS À LA MODE. Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.

Cookery, Domestic Management, &c.—*continued.*De Salis (Mrs.).—*continued.**PUDDINGS AND PASTRY À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*SAVOURIES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*SOUPS AND DRESSED FISH À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*SWEETS AND SUPPER DISHES À LA MODE.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*TEMPTING DISHES FOR SMALL INCOMES.* Fcp. 8vo., 1s. 6d.*WRINKLES AND NOTIONS FOR EVERY HOUSEHOLD.* Crown 8vo., 1s. 6d.Lear.—*MAIGRE COOKERY.* By H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. 16mo., 2s.Poole.—*COOKERY FOR THE DIABETIC.* By W. H. and Mrs. POOLE. With Preface by Dr. PAVY. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Walker (JANE H.).

A BOOK FOR EVERY WOMAN. Part I., The Management of Children in Health and out of Health. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Part II. Woman in Health and out of Health.

A HANDBOOK FOR MOTHERS: being Simple Hints to Women on the Management of their Health during Pregnancy and Confinement, together with Plain Directions as to the Care of Infants. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works.

Allingham.—*VARIETIES IN PROSE.* By WILLIAM ALLINGHAM. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 18s. (Vols. 1 and 2, *Rambles*, by PATRICIUS WALKER. Vol. 3, *Irish Sketches*, etc.)Armstrong.—*ESSAYS AND SKETCHES.* By EDMUND J. ARMSTRONG. Fcp. 8vo., 5s.Bagehot.—*LITERARY STUDIES.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. With Portrait. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.Baring-Gould.—*CURIOUS MYTHS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.* By Rev. S. BARING-GOULD. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.Baynes.—*SHAKESPEARE STUDIES*, and other Essays. By the late THOMAS SPENCER BAYNES, LL.B., LL.D. With a Biographical Preface by Professor LEWIS CAMPBELL. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Boyd (A. K. H.) ('A.K.H.B.').

*And see MISCELLANEOUS THEOLOGICAL WORKS, p. 32.**AUTUMN HOLIDAYS OF A COUNTRY PARSON.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*COMMONPLACE PHILOSOPHER.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*CRITICAL ESSAYS OF A COUNTRY PARSON.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*EAST COAST DAYS AND MEMORIES.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*LANDSCAPES, CHURCHES, AND MORALITIES.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*LEISURE HOURS IN TOWN.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.Boyd (A. K. H.) ('A.K.H.B.').—*continued.**LESSONS OF MIDDLE AGE.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*OUR LITTLE LIFE.* Two Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.*OUR HOMELY COMEDY: AND TRAGEDY.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*RECREATIONS OF A COUNTRY PARSON.* Three Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each. Also First Series. Popular Edition. 8vo., 6d. Sewed.

Butler (SAMUEL).

EREWHON. Crown 8vo., 5s.*THE FAIR HAVEN.* A Work in Defence of the Miraculous Element in our Lord's Ministry. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.*LIFE AND HABIT.* An Essay after a Completer View of Evolution. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.*EVOLUTION, OLD AND NEW.* Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.*ALPS AND SANCTUARIES OF PIEDMONT AND CANTON TICINO.* Illustrated. Pott 4to., 10s. 6d.*LUCK, OR CUNNING, AS THE MAIN MEANS OF ORGANIC MODIFICATION?* Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.*EX VOTO.* An Account of the Sacro Monte or New Jerusalem at Varallo-Sesia. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works—*continued.*

Dreyfus.—*LECTURES ON FRENCH LITERATURE.* Delivered in Melbourne by IRMA DREYFUS. With Portrait of the Author. Large crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Gwilt.—*AN ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ARCHITECTURE.* By JOSEPH GWILT, F.S.A. Illustrated with more than 1100 Engravings on Wood. Revised (1888), with Alterations and Considerable Additions by WYATT PAPWORTH. 8vo., £2 12s. 6d.

Hamlin.—*A TEXT-BOOK OF THE HISTORY OF ARCHITECTURE.* By A. D. F. HAMLIN, A.M., Adjunct-Professor of Architecture in the School of Mines, Columbia College. With 229 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Haweis.—*MUSIC AND MORALS.* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS. With Portrait of the Author, and numerous Illustrations, Facsimiles, and Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

Indian Ideals (No. 1).

NĀRADA SŪTRA: an Inquiry into Love (Bhakti-Jijnāsā). Translated from the Sanskrit, with an Independent Commentary, by E. T. STURDY. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

Jefferies.—(RICHARD).

FIELD AND HEDGEROW: With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE STORY OF MY HEART: my Autobiography. With Portrait and New Preface by C. J. LONGMAN. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

RED DEER. With 17 Illustrations by J. CHARLTON and H. TUNALY. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THE TOILERS OF THE FIELD. With Portrait from the Bust in Salisbury Cathedral. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

WOOD MAGIC: a Fable. With Frontispiece and Vignette by E. V. B. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

THOUGHTS FROM THE WRITINGS OF RICHARD JEFFERIES. Selected by H. S. HOOLE WAYLEN. 16mo., 3s. 6d.

Johnson.—*THE PATENTEE'S MANUAL*: a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent. By J. & J. H. JOHNSON, Patent Agents, &c. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Lang (ANDREW).

LETTERS TO DEAD AUTHORS. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

BOOKS AND BOOKMEN. With 2 Coloured Plates and 17 Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

OLD FRIENDS. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

LETTERS ON LITERATURE. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

COCK LANE AND COMMON SENSE. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Macfarren.—*LECTURES ON HARMONY.* By Sir GEORGE A. MACFARREN. 8vo., 12s.

Marquand and Frothingham.—*A TEXT-BOOK OF THE HISTORY OF SCULPTURE.* By ALLAN MARQUAND, Ph.D., and ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Junr., Ph.D., Professors of Archæology and the History of Art in Princetown University. With 113 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Max Müller (F).

INDIA: WHAT CAN IT TEACH US? Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP.

Vol. I. Recent Essays and Addresses. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

Vol. II. Biographical Essays. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

Vol. III. Essays on Language and Literature. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d. net.

Vol. IV. Essays on Mythology and Folk Lore. Crown 8vo., 8s. 6d. net.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SCIENCE OF MYTHOLOGY. 2 vols. 8vo.

Milner.—*COUNTRY PLEASURES*: the Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a Garden. By GEORGE MILNER. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works—*continued.***Morris (WILLIAM).***SIGNS OF CHANGE.* Seven Lectures delivered on various Occasions. Post 8vo., 4s. 6d.*HOPES AND FEARS FOR ART.* Five Lectures delivered in Birmingham, London, &c., in 1878-1881. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.**Orchard.**—*THE ASTRONOMY OF 'MILTON'S PARADISE LOST'.* By THOMAS N. ORCHARD, M.D., Member of the British Astronomical Association. With 13 Illustrations. 8vo., 15s.**Poore.**—*ESSAYS ON RURAL HYGIENE.* By GEORGE VIVIAN POORE, M.D., F.R.C.P. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.**Proctor.**—*STRENGTH:* How to get Strong and keep Strong, with Chapters on Rowing and Swimming, Fat, Age, and the Waist. By R. A. PROCTOR. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2s.**Richardson.**—*NATIONAL HEALTH.* A Review of the Works of Sir Edwin Chadwick, K.C.B. By Sir B. W. RICHARDSON, M.D. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.**Rossetti.**—*A SHADOW OF DANTE:* being an Essay towards studying Himself, his World and his Pilgrimage. By MARIA FRANCESCA ROSSETTI. With Frontispiece by DANTE GABRIEL ROSSETTI. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.**Solovyoff.**—*A MODERN PRIESTESS OF ISIS (MADAME BLAVATSKY).* Abridged and Translated on Behalf of the Society for Psychical Research from the Russian of VSEVOLOD SERGYEVEVICH SOLOVYOFF. By WALTER LEAF, Litt.D. With Appendices. Crown 8vo., 6s.**Stevens.**—*ON THE STOWAGE OF SHIPS AND THEIR CARGOES.* With Information regarding Freights, Charter-Parties, &c. By ROBERT WHITE STEVENS, Associate-Member of the Institute of Naval Architects. 8vo., 21s.**West.**—*WILLS, AND HOW NOT TO MAKE THEM.* With a Selection of Leading Cases. By B. B. WEST, Author of "Half-Hours with the Millionaires". Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d.

Miscellaneous Theological Works.

* * *For Church of England and Roman Catholic Works see MESSRS. LONGMANS & Co.'s Special Catalogues.***Balfour.**—*THE FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF:* being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology. By the Right Hon. ARTHUR J. BALFOUR, M.P. 8vo., 12s. 6d.**Bird (ROBERT).***A CHILD'S RELIGION.* Cr. 8vo., 2s.*JOSEPH, THE DREAMER.* Crown 8vo., 5s.*JESUS, THE CARPENTER OF NAZARETH.* Crown 8vo., 5s.

To be had also in Two Parts, price 2s. 6d. each.

Part I. GALILEE AND THE LAKE OF GENNESARET.

Part II. JERUSALEM AND THE PERÆA.

Boyd (A. K. H.) ('A.K.H.B.').*OCCASIONAL AND IMMEMORIAL DAYS:* Discourses. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.*COUNSEL AND COMFORT FROM A CITY PULPIT.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*SUNDAY AFTERNOONS IN THE PARISH CHURCH OF A SCOTTISH UNIVERSITY CITY.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*CHANGED ASPECTS OF UNCHANGED TRUTHS.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*GRAVER THOUGHTS OF A COUNTRY PARSON.* Three Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.*PRESENT DAY THOUGHTS.* Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.*SEASIDE MUSINGS.* Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.*'TO MEET THE DAY'* through the Christian Year: being a Text of Scripture, with an Original Meditation and a Short Selection in Verse for Every Day. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Miscellaneous Theological Works—continued.

De la Saussaye.—*A MANUAL OF THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION.* By Professor CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE. Translated by Mrs. COLYER FERGUSON (*née* MAX MÜLLER). Crown 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Gibson.—*THE ABBÉ DE LAMENNAIS. AND THE LIBERAL CATHOLIC MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.* By the Hon. W. GIBSON. With Portrait. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Kalisch (M. M., Ph.D.).

BIBLE STUDIES. Part I. Prophecies of Balaam. 8vo., 10s. 6d. Part II. The Book of Jonah. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT: with a New Translation. Vol. I. Genesis. 8vo., 18s. Or adapted for the General Reader. 12s. Vol. II. Exodus. 15s. Or adapted for the General Reader. 12s. Vol. III. Leviticus, Part I. 15s. Or adapted for the General Reader. 8s. Vol. IV. Leviticus, Part II. 15s. Or adapted for the General Reader. 8s.

Macdonald (GEORGE).

UNSPOKEN SERMONS. Three Series. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Martineau (JAMES).

HOURS OF THOUGHT ON SACRED THINGS: Sermons, 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d. each.

ENDEAVOURS AFTER THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. Discourses. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d.

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION. 8vo., 14s.

ESSAYS, REVIEWS, AND ADDRESSES. 4 Vols. Crown 8vo., 7s. 6d. each.

I. Personal; Political. II. Ecclesiastical; Historical. III. Theological; Philosophical. IV. Academical; Religious.

HOME PRAYERS, with TWO SERVICES for Public Worship. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

10,000/12/96.

Max Müller (F.).

HIBBERT LECTURES ON THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF RELIGION; as illustrated by the Religions of India. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION: Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

NATURAL RELIGION. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

PHYSICAL RELIGION. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1890. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL RELIGION. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

THEOSOPHY, OR PSYCHOLOGICAL RELIGION. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1892. Crown 8vo., 10s. 6d.

THREE LECTURES ON THE VEDĀNTA PHILOSOPHY, delivered at the Royal Institution in March, 1894. 8vo., 5s.

Phillips.—*THE TEACHING OF THE VEDAS.* What Light does it Throw on the Origin and Development of Religion? By MAURICE PHILLIPS, London Mission, Madras. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Romanes.—*THOUGHTS ON RELIGION.* By GEORGE J. ROMANES, LL.D., F.R.S. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d.

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION: an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. 3 vols. 8vo., 36s.

REPLY (A) TO DR. LIGHTFOOT'S ESSAYS. By the Author of 'Supernatural Religion'. 8vo., 6s.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. PETER: a Study. By the Author of 'Supernatural Religion'. 8vo., 6s.

Vivekananda.—*YOGA PHILOSOPHY:* Lectures delivered in New York, Winter of 1895-96, by the Swami Vivekananda, on Raja Yoga; or, Conquering the Internal Nature; also Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms, with Commentaries. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.



Ec.H

V7724kx

Vincent, James Edmund
The land question in North Wales.
2d ed.

515387

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

